PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

# American Philosophical Society

Held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge

VOLUME 103, NUMBER 5 OCTOBER 15, 1959

CONTENTS

Some Episodes in the Life of Charles Darwin. SIR CHARLES GALTON DARWIN 609

The Influence of Darwin on Literature. WILLIAM IRVINE 616

Social Darwinism and the Businessman. IRVIN G. WYLLIE 629

Species before Darwin. CONWAY ZIRKLE 636

The Romanization of Spain: The Problem and the Evidence. T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON 645

Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch (Oration XI). Translated with Introduction and Commentary. GLANVILLE DOWNEY 652

The Presidency and Congressional Leadership: Some Notes on our Changing Constitution. DAVID B. TRUMAN 687

Fisher Ames, Spokesman for New England Federalism. ELISHA P. DOUGLASS 693

Darwin and Religion. JOHN C. GREENE 716

THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

INDEPENDENCE SQUARE

PHILADELPHIA 6

1959

# PUBLICATIONS

OF

# The American Philosophical Society

The publications of the American Philosophical Society consist of PROCEEDINGS, TRANSACTIONS, MEMOIRS, and YEAR BOOK.

THE PROCEEDINGS contains papers which have been read before the Society in addition to other papers which have been accepted for publication by the Committee on Publications. In accordance with the present policy one volume is issued each year, consisting of six bimonthly numbers, and the price is $5.00 net per volume. Current price for individual numbers is $1.00.

THE TRANSACTIONS, the oldest scholarly journal in America, was started in 1769 and is quarto size. In accordance with the present policy each annual volume is a collection of monographs each issued as a part. The annual subscription price is $6.00 net per volume; for both the PROCEEDINGS and the TRANSACTIONS $10.00.

Each volume of the MEMOIRS is published as a book. The titles cover the various fields of learning; most of the recent volumes have been historical. The price of each volume is determined by its size and character.

The YEAR BOOK is of considerable interest to scholars because of the reports on grants for research and to libraries for this reason and because of the section dealing with the acquisitions of the Library. In addition it contains the Charter and Laws, and lists of present and former members, and reports of committees and meetings. The YEAR BOOK is published about April 1 for the preceding calendar year. The price is $1.50.

An author desiring to submit a manuscript for publication should send it to the Editor, William J. Robbins, American Philosophical Society, 104 South Fifth Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa.

# SOME EPISODES IN THE LIFE OF CHARLES DARWIN

SIR CHARLES GALTON DARWIN

Cambridge, England

(*Dinner Address, Commemoration of the Centennial of the Publication of* The Origin of Species *by Charles Darwin, Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Society, April, 1959*)

It was some time ago that I was honoured by an invitation from our president to address the present meeting on the subject of Darwin himself. He explained that in arranging about the various contributions to the meeting it seemed likely—and quite properly so—that most of the papers would be concerned with recent progresses in the subject of evolution and that consequently there was a danger that too little attention might be paid to the author himself who had first given the impulse to all these studies a hundred years ago. I was asked therefore to fill this possible gap in our discussions. I accepted the invitation very willingly, because I had long been hoping to be able to attend one of our annual meetings, and to make a contribution to it, but I must confess that at the time I had very little idea of what the contribution should consist in.

It was intimated to me that I should give some personal account of my grandfather, but this would not be an easy thing for me to do when I remind you that I was born five years after his death, so that at best the contribution must be indirect. I remember my grandmother very well, since she died at the age of eighty-eight when I was about nine years old. During each of those years for half the year she lived in Cambridge, and I suppose I saw her once a week or so or even more often. For the rest of the year she was at Down, and we children used to spend a good many of our holidays there. However, the impressions of a small boy about a very old lady are not really very interesting, since they are apt to be concentrated on such questions as what we should be given to eat that would be different from what we got at home, and what different kinds of games could be played in her garden.

My only real contact then with my grandfather was in later life indirectly through my father and uncles and aunts. They were a very closely united family, so that we saw more of them and of our cousins than is perhaps the case in most families. This was made the easier because in addition to my own family two of my uncles and one aunt were all living in Cambridge, so that there was a natural focus to all such meetings. But that was certainly not the whole reason. Though they were all engaged in different professions there was a strong underlying similarity in their characters and their interests. It is true that of the five brothers one was a banker, one an astronomer, another a botanist, another a soldier and the other an engineer, but the outlook of all of them was very similar, and I think it must have been mainly a genetical similarity, for their upbringing was very free from the sort of parental control that would have enforced uniformity. It is true that they all had a very great affection for their home at Down, and that they tended to regard everything about the place as nearly perfect, but I do not think it was this environment that was the cause of their similarities. To the ends of their lives it always seemed to me that they valued one another's company more than that of any of even their closest friends.

I have explained this family situation because it might be expected that we would have collected from these uncles a great many stories about their father and the old life at Down. But this was not so. I shall be mentioning later a few of the things I did gather from them, but for the most part they were all forward-looking men and were much more interested in the present and the future than in the past. So I fear I shall not be able to quote very much about their father from the direct experiences of their youth.

I can best get back into the past by beginning with a short account of some events at which I was myself present. This was the celebration exactly fifty years ago of the centenary of my grandfather's birth, which was coupled with the celebration of the jubilee of the publication of *The Origin of Species*. The celebration took place in Cambridge in the June of 1909. There were

a great many distinguished guests invited from all over the world. These included Sir Joseph Hooker, then ninety-four, who was staying with one of my uncles, and I well recall meeting him. I may remind you that when in 1858 my grandfather received the paper by Alfred Russell Wallace from Celebes proposing the theory of Natural Selection, he referred the question of what ought to be done to Hooker and Lyell, and it was they who decided on the famous joint publications in the Linnaean Society's journal, the centenary of which was celebrated in London last year at the International Zoological Congress. Wallace himself was invited to the celebration of course, but his advanced age and his health prevented him from coming. To my great disappointment I therefore never saw him.

The ceremonies included a reception, the giving of honorary degrees, a dinner given by the University, and two garden parties, in one of which Christ's College was the host, in the other my father and uncles. There was also a book of the type of a Festschrift brought out. Some thirty authors contributed, among whom, to name only a few, were Hooker, Weissmann, de Vries, Bateson and Haeckel. There was then also printed for the first time, under the editorship of Francis Darwin, the two essays of 1842 and 1844, written respectively seventeen and fifteen years before the publication of *The Origin of Species,* in which Darwin had first propounded the whole theory of Evolution by Natural Selection.

Honorary degrees were given to a number of distinguished guests, and there were addresses delivered in the Senate House, by the chancellor Lord Rayleigh, and by Metchnikoff, and Henry Fairfield Osborn. I might add that it had been hoped that Wallace would be there to receive an honorary degree too; in fact this was the second time he was invited to accept one, since it had been offered to him many years before, but then too he had been unable to come.

Perhaps I may mention a small personal experience I had on that occasion. As the company was breaking up I was approached by a man quite unknown to me, who told me his name was Wickham, and that he was descended from the man of that name who had been first lieutenant of the *Beagle* during the famous voyage. In the main work of the survey Wickham had been the leading assistant to Captain Fitzroy, and much of the time he had been acting nearly independently in auxiliary ships that they hired for this service. Incidentally after this voyage the next cruise of the *Beagle* was under his command, doing the survey of the northern coasts of Australia. In such a case the surveyor has one curious difficulty always to contend with, and that is the giving of names to all the totally unnamed capes and bays that he is exploring. I have been told that Wickham solved this problem by taking a list of the names of his former shipmates and working through the list one by one, and it happened that the name Darwin came up for a certain bay, which has now become the most important harbour in northwestern Australia.

Of all the celebrations the function I remember best is the dinner, but I must confess that my memory has been helped by finding a year or two ago a reprint of all the speeches made at it. It was the first large public dinner I had ever attended. There were about five hundred people at it, including the invited delegates and also many others both from Cambridge and elsewhere. As chancellor, Lord Rayleigh presided. The only toast was to the memory of Darwin, which was proposed by Arthur Balfour, the former prime minister. He, together with his zoologist brother Frank Balfour, had been from undergraduate days close friends of my father, and he had been well acquainted with the life at Down. Apart from personal memories of this he mainly spoke about the consequences of the acceptance of the evolutionary theory in England. The toast was seconded by Arrhenius who naturally paid more attention to the international field, and it was then drunk in silence. The reply to it was made by the head of our family, my uncle William, who made an admirable speech giving a number of personal recollections of his youth and of the affection with which the children had always been regarded by their father. This was followed by a speech from Professor Poulton of Oxford, and the dinner terminated with a short speech from the vice-chancellor of that year, Canon Mason. The end of his speech is worth quoting in detail. He said that it had been proposed to him that a telegram should be sent to Alfred Russell Wallace in the following terms:

> The naturalists assembled at Cambridge for the Darwin Celebration cannot forget your share in the great work which they commemorate, and regret your inability to be present. [He went on:] There is but one word I regret in the telegram, though I shall send it as it stands. It is the word "naturalists,"

because I claim as a theologian—and I see representatives of law, music and letters and many other sciences and arts present—that only one spirit animates us all, and I should beg that we might be included in the term "naturalists."

The details of my grandfather's life have been published in many biographies, and it would serve little purpose for me to give what would in effect only be a short abstract of those works. It happens however that I have recently had occasion to re-read the *Naturalist's Voyage*, and also a number of more recent publications derived from Darwin's diaries and note-books that have been brought out by my cousin Lady Barlow. I have also studied the two volumes about the voyage that were written by Captain Fitzroy, its commander. A few incidents derived from these works provide starting points for my present purpose.

Fitzroy was a most remarkable man. He was a high aristocrat, being the grandson of a duke, and on his mother's side a nephew of the great Lord Castlereagh who had played the chief part in the reorganisation of Europe after the defeat of Napoleon. He was a very capable navigator, entirely a master of the duties of survey that he had been commissioned to do, a master of seamanship and a good commander as well. But less to be expected, he added to all these qualities the capacity of authorship, so that he could make interesting even many of the quite trivial details of the voyage. A man of such strong character naturally also presented problems to his collaborators, and all through the voyage there were dangers of quarrels with Darwin, especially since Fitzroy's religion was strongly fundamentalist, and though the germ of the evolutionary theory had been barely sown in Darwin's mind during the voyage, it was evident that there might be causes of serious disagreement. In fact there were several quarrels—during five years of the closest association, that would be almost unavoidable between any two strong characters—but they were always soon reconciled again. The first incident I shall describe is connected with one of these quarrels.

This is the question of slavery. I may remind you that there had long been going on an agitation for its abolition, and this was coming to a head at the very time the *Beagle* set sail. Indeed the final Act of Parliament abolishing slavery in all British possessions was passed in 1833 about halfway through the time of the voyage. Consequently political passions on the subject were running very high.

Darwin and all his family were convinced liberals, and so on the side for abolition. Indeed his grandfather Erasmus Darwin fifty years earlier had taken some part in the earlier proposals in favour of it. Fitzroy, from his birth and upbringing, was a conservative.

Their first visit to a slave state was at Bahia in Brazil. With their opposing political views, it was to be expected that each noticed only one aspect of the matter, Darwin noting the misery and squalour of the most down-trodden of the slaves, and Fitzroy seeing that many of them were quite as prosperous and well-treated as the free men of England. In an argument they had on the subject he told Darwin that he had visited a large slave-owner and that he had questioned him about the condition of his slaves. The man had then called up many of his own slaves one by one and asked them whether they wanted to be free, and with one accord they had all said no. On this Darwin made the comment that one would not have expected them to answer in any other way to an all-powerful master. This was their first quarrel and it was some time before Fitzroy forgave him for what he had said.

All through his life Darwin retained this horror of slavery, and there was a sequel to this many years later, which was told by my uncle William in the speech he made at the Cambridge celebration dinner. I must explain it by referring shortly to a historical event that most people have certainly now forgotten. In the year 1861 there were serious riots in Jamaica by the negroes, who had by then of course been free men for twenty-eight years. It looked as if it was a conspiracy carefully planned, and there were indications that they intended to massacre all the whites and turn Jamaica into another Haiti. That at least was the view of the Governor, by name Eyre, and he put down the revolt with some severity. Unfortunately the matter became one of strong political feeling in England, one party holding that he had acted with unnecessary and illegal severity, and the other that he had saved a very dangerous situation. Emotion and prejudice ran so high that we cannot feel that any impartial decision between the two opinions will now ever be reached.

Anyhow with his detestation of slavery Darwin was naturally on the side that thought that Governor Eyre had behaved badly. His son

William was now a young man in a bank in Southampton, and he happened to be visiting his home during Eyre's trial. One evening he referred to a public meeting that had been held in Southampton in favour of Eyre, and to quote what he said at the 1909 dinner:

> I made some flippant and derogatory remarks about the Committee which was prosecuting him. My father instantly turned on me in a fury of indigation and told me I had better go back to Southampton. The next morning at seven o'clock he came to my bedside and said how sorry he was that he had been so angry, and that he had not been able to sleep; and with a few kind words he left me.

To his dying day opposition to slavery remained one of Darwin's dominating emotions.

Returning to the subject of Captain Fitzroy, I once asked one of my uncles whether he himself could remember him. He answered that he had never seen him, and that he had never been invited to Down. It had been judged too likely to provoke a quarrel on account of his narrow fundamentalist views on the one side and the Evolutionary Theory on the other. So after the voyage they never met again, though I believe they occasionally corresponded, especially on such occasions as when Fitzroy was congratulated on getting a new appointment in his distinguished career. This was in contrast to the other shipmates of the *Beagle*, with whom he kept contact for long afterwards, including not only the senior officers, but also the man who was his servant for much of the voyage, by name Covington, whose career he watched and helped for many years.

Turning now to another subject, my grandfather in later life was quite notorious for his incompetence in foreign languages, and this was really a great handicap to him because he needed to read many foreign biological publications in the course of his studies. His special antipathy was German, which he called the "verdammte," giving each letter in the word its full English value. On one occasion my father was translating for him a paper that had been published in Vienna, of which the German name I may remind you is Wien. When the translation was finished, my grandfather asked, "Where is this place Wy-enn, where so many books are printed?"

However, on re-reading recently his diary of the *Beagle* voyage, I cannot help believing that for a time at least he must have had a good mastery of Spanish. He records that, while staying for a couple of months in the town of Maldonado, he took lessons in Spanish, and in many of his later tours he was living exclusively with men who had no other language, and there is never any sign of his having had any difficulty in consequence.

I think the matter is clinched by one episode that he records, obviously with some amusement. In one of his later tours in Chile, he was staying in a ranch, and the young ladies of the family engaged him in an argument on the subject of religion. To their horror they discovered that the bishops in his church were allowed to marry, and therefore they said that he could not possibly be a Christian. He seems to have been perfectly capable of carrying on the argument on this deep theological subject, and I cannot believe that he could have done this without a fairly competent mastery of the language.

In the matter of his talking Spanish there is another incident I may describe. The *Beagle* had to spend much of its time surveying the details of the southeastern coast of the continent, and during this time Darwin was free to go on tours inland. The longest of these, and I think the most dangerous, was from Carmen de Patagones on the Rio Negro, six hundred miles northwards to Buenos Aires. It was done of course on horseback, for most of the time in the company only of gauchos, each rider having a relay of horses which he would ride in turn. At the beginning of the journey the country is semi-desert, and when it came towards nightfall they would ride on until they came to a puddle of water, and they had to use that for drinking, no matter how muddy it was. They would then off-saddle and camp under the open sky. Further north the country became less arid and their life became easier.

I have said it was a dangerous journey, and the reason is that there was at the time a war going on between the Spaniards and the Indians. It was a war of extermination, because the Spanish gauchos considered that they could never really occupy the country when all the time they were open to murdering raids from the Indians, who could emerge from the remote foothills of the far-off Cordillera. The general commanding the army was a wealthy ranchero called Rosas, and his army was encamped on the Rio Colorado some 150 miles north of Darwin's starting point. It

was necessary to obtain a passport from General Rosas before they could go on. Darwin had good recommendations from the government at Buenos Aires, and the secretary made no difficulty. However General Rosas expressed the wish to see him, and he was granted an interview. He notes that this interview passed off with great dignity without a smile, and though it had made him lose two whole days in waiting for it, he records that in the course of his later travels he gained much advantage from having met the great man.

Rosas was the most outstanding man at the time in all South America, and not long after this he became dictator of the Argentine—though it was only later that the country acquired that name. After ruling it successfully for many years, a political revolution finally drove him into exile. Years afterwards my grandfather was visiting his son in Southampton, and one day when they were out for a walk, they saw a horseman coming along, and my grandfather suddenly said, "That man rides like a gaucho." It was General Rosas himself who had selected Southampton for his place of exile. I never heard, however, that they renewed acquaintance.

An interesting matter suggested by the history of the voyage is the question of health. In later life Darwin became almost famous for his ill health, and I have to confess that I find exceedingly tiresome the many quite unverifiable conjectures that have been made about its cause. But during the voyage he was quite conspicuous for his health and vigour. Two special cases are cited by Fitzroy.

They were engaged in surveying the southern coasts of Tierra del Fuego, and two boats set off from the *Beagle*, carrying both Fitzroy and Darwin, to survey what is now called the Beagle Channel and some of the sounds and islands to the westwards of it. In all they went nearly three hundred miles. The living was very rough, including being wet through for days on end, having to pitch their small tents in swamps, and having to do their best to avoid the thieving natives. One day they were encamped under a high mountain from which the glaciers descended right into the sea, and they suddenly heard a loud roar, and could see that a huge mass of ice had fallen into the water. This started a great wave threatening to destroy their boats, which were moored at some distance from the encampment. It was Darwin and one of the men who dashed off over the very rough ground towards the boats, and they managed to get there in time to haul them up out of the reach of the great waves.

If they had not succeeded in this it might have been very serious for the whole party, because, if the boats had escaped wreck, they would probably have broken loose and drifted away, and in that case the natives would have got hold of them and destroyed them for the sake of the equipment. At the camp they had few provisions or tools, and the best they could have hoped to do would have been to construct some sort of canoe, and send it off more than a hundred miles to the *Beagle*, so as to bring back a rescue party. Altogether it might easily have been the end of them.

It was perhaps to honour this action that Fitzroy gave the name Mount Darwin to the mountain under which they were encamped. From their survey work it proved to be nearly and even perhaps quite as high as Mount Sarmiento, the dominant peak of Tierra del Fuego, which lies rather further north in the better known regions near the Straits of Magellan.

The second example of Darwin's vigour was in the deserts of southern Patagonia. The country there is a flat table-land carrying only a few small desert plants, and populated by a few ostriches and guanacos (the wild llamas) and condors. They could also see signs that it was occasionally visited by Indians, who presumably came over from the rainy west side of the continent, which there is only about two hundred miles wide. The *Beagle* stopped at a place called Port St. Julian, I think uninhabited except for occasional visits from nomadic Patagonians, and while the ship was engaged in the survey of the adjacent coasts, a party set out to walk for a day towards the west intending to get as far as they could. They were loaded with survey instruments, and also with guns, for defence in case that was needed, and also in the hope of getting fresh meat, which is always eagerly desired by a ship at sea. They also of course carried provisions for the day, and water bottles, but the air was very dry and hot and they ran short of water. The loads were shared all round, and in particular Fitzroy himself was very heavily loaded, since he was carrying not only some of the survey instruments, but also his heavy gun. After going for some hours they became very tired and extremely

thirsty, and indeed two or three of them, including Fitzroy himself, were quite exhausted.

At this point they saw a lake a couple of miles on, and Darwin and one of the less tired men went on to it to fill the water bottles for the rest. They could be seen by the others to arrive at the lake and to bend down, but then they stood up again; it was not water but a dry salt-pan. From there Darwin could see what looked like another lake a further two miles on, so they walked on to it, to be disappointed again, and they had to return empty handed.

Fitzroy and some of the others were still incapable of moving, so they were left with the guns for defence, and with some scrubby bushes which they could set alight, so as to signal their position, and the rest went back to the ship to send out a rescue party. In all they were seventeen hours without water. Fitzroy notes that they were none of them in the end the worse for the experience, and that Darwin had distinguished himself above all the rest in his capacity for keeping going in extreme fatigue, but that he had paid for it, spending the next two days in his hammock with a high fever.

In the course of the whole five years of the voyage, it was only natural that there should have been some sickness in the crew, but I would judge that for the conditions of those days the *Beagle* was a remarkably healthy ship. Darwin himself had a share of the sickness, and quite early in the voyage he was laid up for a fortnight with a badly inflamed knee, but we must recall that nothing was known in those days about disinfectants, so that the merest scratch could produce serious trouble. He also had a more serious illness while on a tour from Buenos Aires to the city of Santa Fé on the Parana. I conjecture that it was malaria, and it forced him to return downstream on a boat instead of the usual horseback. Later in the voyage he was seriously ill in Chile, and spent a month in bed in the house of a hospitable English merchant in Valparaiso, suffering from a disease that was never diagnosed. However he seems to have made a complete recovery, so that he could later do a four hundred mile tour along the desert coast of northern Chile. Later again he did what appears to have been some quite dangerous mountaineering for a day or two in Tahiti, and yet again tours of more than one hundred miles in both Australia and South Africa. We must conclude that he came away from those five years a strong and vigorous man, and that his later ill-health was in no way due to the voyage.

I will conclude by mentioning some of the most important impressions given to Darwin in the course of the voyage. One was his first view of a tropical forest at Bahia in Brazil. In his diary he writes:

> The delight one experiences in such times bewilders the mind; if the eye attempts to follow the flight of a gaudy butter-fly, it is arrested by some strange tree or fruit; if watching an insect one forgets it in the stranger flower it is crawling over; if turning to admire the splendour of the scenery, the individual character of the foreground fixes the attention. The mind is a chaos of delight, out of which a world of future and more quiet pleasure will arise.

A second impression was his first view of a Tierra del Fuegian savage, with no clothes at all except a large guanaco skin with the hair outside. This was merely thrown over the shoulders, and for any exercise it was cast off, so that they were absolutely naked, and this in a climate with temperature seldom above 50° F., and with high gales and much rain and often snow. He describes an old man, evidently a chief, with long black matted hair round his face, over which he wore a cap of white feathers. His face was covered by a broad band of red paint reaching from ear to ear across his upper lip, and above this a parallel band of white paint. He says the Fuegians resembled the representations of Devils on the stage, for instance in the opera *Der Freischutz*. He writes:

> I would not have believed how entire the difference between savage and civilized man is; it is greater than the difference between a wild and a domesticated animal,

and he adds long comments on their savage behaviour.

The third great impression that he records was the sight of the great mountains of the Andes. From Valparaiso he did a tour over two high passes of the Andes across to Mendoza on the east side and back again, from which can be viewed the tremendous mountains Tupungato and Aconcagua, which is the highest mountain of the whole range.

These three were the most impressive memories that he brought away from the voyage, but there is one further comment I must give which can be found at the conclusion of his diary. He there spends a few pages on some considerations about

the advantages and disadvantages of travel. These pages are well worth reading, but there is one point he makes which I will end with. He records that in later life when his memory wanders back to the recollection of his experiences, it is none of these tremendous sights that first comes back into his mind. It is the plains of Patagonia,

> without habitations, without water, without trees, without mountains; they support merely a few dwarf plants. Why then, and the case is not peculiar to myself, do these arid wastes take so firm possession of the memory?

I think many of us will agree that in our own recollections of the past, it is very often not the most spectacular things that prove to have been the most important for us. But here I will end, in the hope that I have succeeded in giving some impressions of the author of *The Origin of Species*.

# THE INFLUENCE OF DARWIN ON LITERATURE

**WILLIAM IRVINE**

Professor of English, Leland Stanford University

(*Commemoration of the Centennial of the Publication of* The Origin of Species *by Charles Darwin, Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Society, April, 1959*)

LISTING, in the excitement of a great work completed, the regions of the spirit which his ideas would revolutionize, Darwin does not mention poetry, the drama, the novel, or literary criticism. Had these possibilities been suggested to him, he would doubtless, in his own familiar phrase, have been "astonished." Nevertheless, he did of course profoundly affect not only what writers wrote about life, but what critics wrote about literature.

## I. INFLUENCE ON THE STUDY OF LITERATURE

Literary study, like nearly everything else, had long been moving in Darwin's direction. In the Reformation theologians discovered history while disputing the relative authenticity of Catholic and Protestant Christianity.[1] In the seventeenth century, literary critics discovered progress while disputing the relative excellence of ancient and modern authors and thinkers. In the eighteenth century, Vico, Hurd, Wharton, and other preromantics discovered that the primitive ages were full of poetry and imagination, while Voltaire, Gibbon, and other rationalists discovered that they were full of prejudice and ignorance. Such discoveries permitted Laharpe to write, in his *Cours de littérature*, the first history of European literature. Herder, the Schlegels, and Madame de Staël now began to explain books and authors as the products of climate, geography, race, national character, social institutions, historical period, and literary tradition. Goethe traced all literary *genres* to an *Urpoesie*, as in his botanical work on metamorphosis he traced all plants to an *Urpflanze*. Romanticism was making everybody biology-minded. Such concepts as the vital unity of the organism, classification according to archetype, the relation of the plant to the seed, of the animal to his environment, were constantly before the minds of the historical critics.[2]

Sainte-Beuve (1804–1869) illustrates how biological, how elaborately historical and solidly scientific, criticism had become before Darwin. Not that he was merely scientific. This remarkable man read everybody and knew everybody, experiencing, so to speak at first hand, the whole intellectual history of a half-century inside a single mind. In him a romantic idealist died young and left a melancholy skeptic doubtful even of "his own doubt" and a scientific "naturalist of minds"[3] insatiably curious about facts and morbidly anxious to verify them. Wisely reticent on the metaphysical influence of climate, he studied an author in relation to his heredity, his family history, his literary circle, his closest friend, his inveterate rival, his master passion, his characteristic weakness, his disciples and later reputation.[4] Sainte-Beuve did not pretend to scientific certitude: the literary animal was complex, and having free will, not altogether predictable. Sainte-Beuve was simply preparing sound monographs for some great generalizer of a more scientific age. His monographs were not only sound, but brilliant and searching; yet because of the deterministic tendency of their method, they dealt more with the author than the book, and more with essentially explicable men of mere talent than with inexplicable men of genius.

The scientific method which Sainte-Beuve practiced with caution and many reservations, Taine (1828–1893) took up with triumphant self-confidence and no reservations whatever. He must—at least in the excitement of thought—have

[1] Guérard, A. J., The growth of the historical spirit, *Stanford Studies in Lang. & Lit.*, 5, Stanford, California, Univ. Press, 1941.

[2] Wellek, René, *A history of modern criticism: 1750–1950* **1**: 209–225, New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1955.

[3] Quoted by Babbitt, Irving, *Masters of modern French criticism*, 111, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1912.

[4] Sainte-Beuve, C. A., *Nouveaux lundis* **3**: 1–33, Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1865.

felt himself the great generalizer for whom Sainte-Beuve had been preparing monographs.

As Sainte-Beuve was interested mainly in the evolution of the individual author, Taine was mainly interested in that of national literatures and cultures, with a view to a philosophy of history. Taine illustrates how little mere facts or method make the scientist. He bristles with facts, but what he really did with them, as Irving Babbitt observes, was to line them up and make them march.[5] He was a great generalizer, as Sainte-Beuve was a great particularizer. In practice, he carried Sainte-Beuve's doctrine of the master passion to a fantastic extreme—partly to make human nature more exciting, but mainly to make it more easily explicable in terms of "heredity, environment, and period."[6] Taine once likened a literature to a cage of wild animals. His *History of English Literature* has the effect of making criticism as clear as a demonstration in geometry and as exciting as a visit to the zoo. Actually, he was the victim of his own magnificent style, which combined great abstract clarity with brilliant local color in detail. He mistook mastery of style for mastery of subject and scientific principle.

Sainte-Beuve speaks of a debt to Lamarck; Taine, of a debt to Cuvier and Geoffroy Sainte-Hilaire, though actually he owed more to Comte and Mill.[7] Paradoxically, the first eminent critic to be strongly influenced by Darwin was neither a relativist nor a doctrinaire naturalist, but a conservative who eventually became a Roman Catholic. Ferdinand Brunetière (1849–1906) had admired Darwin since 1875. In 1890, he published the first volume of a vast work on the *Évolution des Genres*. Enthusiastic and laborious men sometimes expect miracles from hard labor and immense projects. His introduction reveals that Brunetière expected a great deal both of Darwin and himself. Darwinian principles are not only to explain the evolution of literary genres, but to explain it with scientific exactitude—and thereby to put criticism on a new basis. If a new work could be judged accurately according to the laws of its genre, obviously the benefit to literary excellence, and therefore to literature, would be great.[8]

Brunetière's first volume treats the evolution of criticism. It traces the decline of judicial criticism based on the classical rules and the rise of historical criticism based on biological analogy. Brunetière does not attempt any elaborate application of Darwinian principles. Perhaps he regarded this work as a preliminary research into method. Criticizing his predecessors, he finds that Thierry makes literary evolution too much a matter of little-known ethnological causes, that Renan gives it too much pseudo-scientific exactitude, that Sainte-Beuve introduces a colorful particularity and a psychological complication that obscure general trends and laws.[9] Plainly, Brunetière hoped to combine the judicial with the historical method, and to practise Renan's exactitude without falling into pseudo-science.

His volumes on the *Évolution de la Poésie Lyrique* seem to illustrate his method most fully. Here he particularly bore in mind Darwin's emphasis on origins and genealogy, and his concepts of progressive, retrogressive, and divergent evolution. Brunetière begins by pointing out that lyric poetry is essentially individualistic. French lyric poetry takes its rise in the work of such Renaissance individualists as Ronsard and Du Bellay. In the seventeenth century it succumbs to the oratorical spirit of a highly social civilization and becomes scarcely distinguishable, except in form, from prose. It is revived in the eighteenth century as lyric prose by the romantic individualist Rousseau and then, as a useful variation naturally selected, is given epic grandeur and historical local color by Châteaubriand. Restored to poetry by Chénier, it bifurcates into the virtuoso lyric of Hugo and the intimate lyric of de Musset, invades the novel in the works of George Sand and the drama in the plays of Hugo, becomes thoughtful in de Vigny and objective and impersonal in Leconte de Lisle, exhausting all possible themes and modes of expression at one stage of development before passing into another. Brunetière concludes by observing that evolution does not necessarily mean progress and that the late nineteenth-century lyric may represent a retrogression from previous heights.

As a whole, Brunetière's work is a disappoint-

[5] *Op. cit.*, 219.

[6] Taine, H., Introduction, *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* **1**: xxii–xxxi, Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1905.

[7] Giraud, Victor, *Essai sur Taine: son œuvre et son influence*, 26–29, 52–69, Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1902.

[8] Brunetière, Ferdinand, *L'évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature* **1**: 13, Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1898.

[9] *Ibid.* **1**: 219, 235, 242.

ment. Yet to criticize it in detail would be very nearly to lay down principles for an alternative scheme of literary evolution. Perhaps for this reason, critics have explained him rather than criticized him. He has been accused, for example, of utilizing Darwin for a partisan purpose. When he published the first volume of his *Évolution des Genres*, he had indeed long been waging fierce but discriminating war against various forms of pseudo-science and romanticism. He might well have meant, and quite honestly, to use the prestige, the insights, and the impartiality of science to identify decadence on the one hand and to emphasize the living greatness of the past on the other.[10] Actually, he seems to have made a considerable effort to be impartial, but to have arrived at the end of his long study in some bewilderment about its ultimate significance. He emphasizes that evolution does not necessarily mean progress, and yet seems to imply that, artistically at least, progress in lyric poetry had been made since the time of Rousseau. So far as I can judge, the greatest single weakness of the *Évolution de la Poésie Lyrique* is that Brunetière connects lyric poetry so closely with romantic individualism that romanticism appears a symptom of artistic excellence and poetry, a symptom of moral decadence.[11] In short, his greatest fault is not that he is too partisan, but that, like Taine, he is too abstract and schematic, that he exhibits too much *esprit de géometrie* and too little *esprit de finesse*.[12] To class him with Taine is perhaps unfair. Nevertheless, in his drastic use of the parallel-passage method, in this summing up of an author in a few phrases, and in his neat opposition of romanticism as inward and individual to neo-classicism as outward and social, he does grossly simplify.

Brunetière does not simplify in the interests of his theory. Had he been less simple, he might have been more Darwinian. To be sure, he does prove that literary evolution is not essentially teleological or necessarily progressive. He demonstrates, in broad parallel to Darwin, that poetry evolves into many divergent forms under favorable conditions, and assimilates to prose under unfavorable; and that fruitful themes are seldom discarded until all their implications have been realized. On the other hand, for all his elaborate theoretical preparations, he does not arrive at any general laws, nor indeed does he attempt to apply natural selection systematically to the evolution of lyric poetry or any other genre. In several passages he himself suggests that his Darwinism is but a metaphor.[13]

One Darwinian principle which he did consistently apply, however, was the genetic method, which soon became a permanent acquisition for literary study, particularly in the history of ideas. Brunetière was at his best as an historian of ideas. Significantly, two other eminent scholars in this field, A. O. Lovejoy and J. B. Bury,[14] were also deeply interested in Darwin and in evolution. Brunetière's American disciple, Irving Babbitt, produced in his *Rousseau and Romanticism* one of the best-known twentieth-century studies in the history of ideas. Like his teacher, Babbitt invokes the prestige and the example of science. In fact, he invokes them against science itself—in attacking what theologians call "the naturalistic fallacy" in ethics: to be truly scientific, he says, the critic must not only study the facts with proper detachment and exactness, but he must take account of the law for man as well as the law for thing.[15]

In the United States, Taine aroused much more interest than did Brunetière, and—in vague compliment to Darwin's vast prestige—was mistakenly regarded as the chief exponent of Darwinism in literature. His exaltation and practice of literary energy, his vivid facts and clear, startling generalizations exerted an almost hypnotic effect, from which even such men as Henry James and W. D. Howells did not entirely escape.[16] Meanwhile, in the United States, as in England, journalistic critics propounded all sorts of vague and pretentious Darwinisms.

In England, Walter Bagehot explained the evolution of style, and, in the United States, Archibald Henderson[17] explained the evolution of the drama, by natural selection. Bagehot's discussion is brief—a mere literary illustration in

[10] Giraud, Victor, Brunetière, *Chefs de File*, ed. Flammarian, E., 94–100, Paris, 1932.

[11] *L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique* **1**: 131, 145, Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1905.

[12] Babbitt, *op. cit.*, 299.

[13] *L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique* **2**: 287.

[14] Bury, J. B., "Darwinism and history," Haekel, Thompson, and others, Evolution in modern thought. Modern Library, 246–264, New York, Boni and Liveright.

[15] Introduction, *Rousseau and romanticism*, x–xi, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1919.

[16] Clark, Harry H., The influence of science on American literary criticism, 1860–1910, including the vogue of Taine, *Trans. Wisconsin Acad. Sci., Arts & Letters* **4**: 147–148.

[17] *The changing drama, contributions and tendencies*, Cincinnati, Stewart and Kidd, 1919.

the argument of *Physics and Politics,* yet, published in 1867 and 1868, it is one of the first, and perhaps the most satisfactory, application of Darwinism to literature. Bagehot begins by observing that an age, like a nation, develops its own special character and taste.[18] How does it do so? Potentially at least, it slightly prefers certain ideas presented in certain words to other ideas presented in other words. Sooner or later a vigorous, forward man, like Steele in Queen Anne's age, strikes out a rough notion of the timely style. Other writers are impressed and unconsciously imitate him, until a meditative and fastidious writer, like Addison, brings the style to perfection. Meanwhile, the style itself has deepened and confirmed the preference. Those readers who dislike it read earlier literature. Those writers who do not use it find few or no readers.

In a long paper it would be necessary to discuss examples of Darwinian influence once removed, as in the pragmatic and Marxist critics. Here it is sufficient to point out that the most important contribution of Darwin to literary study was the concept of genetic development.

## II. INFLUENCE ON THE PRACTICE OF LITERATURE

In the strict literary sense, Darwin wrote little prose and less poetry, yet few English poets or prose writers have influenced English literature so much. Properly, the story begins some time before Darwin. In the disintegrating religious civilization of the Renaissance and Reformation, England early developed a scientific tradition. With the authority of a Lord Chancellor, Bacon had ridiculed deductive thinking about books and recommended inductive thinking about nature. With an authority even more impressive, Newton had demonstrated that astronomical nature operates as a vast and precise machine. Locke now explained how Newton's quantitative nature of matter and motion produced in the human mind a qualitative experience of sensation and reflection, and from the finite intelligences of men on the one hand and the order, harmony, and beauty of nature on the other, he inferred an infinite, benevolent, creative Intelligence. Thus, nature became a kind of alternative revelation. God was certain as mathematics—and nearly as cold. Such a nature might have been little more than a short way to skepticism had not platonists like More and Cudworth seen in it a pervasive, activating spirit and eloquent sentimentalists like Shaftesbury and Rousseau, an inspiring beauty and a beneficent moral influence. Nature conceived as beauty and benevolence had thus led to a faith in which men might find some of the grandeur and consolation of traditional religion without having to believe in an outmoded theology or subject themselves to a rigorous and depressing moral system.[1]

The great exemplar of this faith was of course Wordsworth. As Locke in his *Essay* explains how sensation and reflection build up mind,[2] so Wordsworth in his "Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey" describes in a more general way how impressions and associations have in his case built up soul. Beholding the same landscape once more after five years, he sees that it has provided him with an inward store of beauties which have comforted him in weariness, softened him in irritation, and in rare moments raised him to a sublimer mood

> In which the burthen of the mystery . . .
> Of all this unintelligible world
> Is lightened:

and

> . . . with an eye made quiet by the power
> Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,[3]

he sees into the life of things.

In his *Biographia Literaria*[4] Coleridge politely indicated some of the defects of Wordsworth's creed, and Wordsworth himself discovered, even before subsiding into old age and Tory Christianity, that he needed something more than the scenery around Tintern to chasten his spirit and sweeten his temper. Yet the religion of nature remained an element to be reckoned with in the thinking of literary men. Thereafter, it became revolutionary in Shelley, safe and Anglican in John Keble, and, in America, transcendental in

[18] *Physics and politics, works and life* **8**: 22–24, London, Longmans, Greene, 1915.

[1] Beach, Joseph W., *The concept of nature in nineteenth-century English poetry,* 4–8, New York, Macmillan, 1936.

[2] David Hartley was the immediate influence. See Beatty, Arthur, William Wordsworth, his doctrine & art in their historical relations, *Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Lang. & Lit.* **17**.

[3] Wordsworth, William, Lines composed a few miles above Tintern Abbey, on revisiting the banks of the Wye during a tour, July 13, 1798, ll. 38, 40, 41, 47, 48.

[4] Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *Biographia literaria,* ed. Shawcross, J., **2**: 5–131, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1907.

Emerson, and—joined with other eighteenth-century furniture which Bernard Shaw thought characteristic of the American mind—boisterous and noisy in Walt Whitman.

As a serious creed, however, it faded with the rosy haze and the infinite promise of the revolutionary period. Even before it faded, evangelical Christianity had been revived among the lower and middle classes by John Wesley, and made politically and socially formidable by the Reform Bill of 1832. Living simultaneously, and with much bewilderment, in an old world of faith and a new world of industry and science, most educated Victorians were at once too religious and too practical to regard nature worship as much more than a lesser revelation to be perused on picnics and excursions. The sentimental rationalism of the deists gave way before the gloomy, deterministic rationalism of the political economists and the even gloomier, deterministic rationalism of Calvinistic preachers. Moreover, to recover a religion involves the risk of once more losing it. Hume and Gibbon reappeared with all their skeptical horrors and fascinations. Young men laid down their Byrons to pick up their Shelleys, and often went on to read Laplace and Lamarck with fear and trembling. Thinking was at first an exhilarating, and then a dangerous and depressing occupation. Doubt became chronic, and ulcers often had metaphysical causes. Scanning the heavens in the eighteen-thirties, Tennyson saw in his darker moods not the Newtonian harmonies of benevolent Intelligence, but blind mechanism and vacant immensity.[5]

In fact, Tennyson illustrates how Darwinian a poet could be before Darwin. He also exemplifies, within the confines of a single mind, the long Victorian warfare between science and religion. The son of an Anglican minister and the impressionable nephew of an aggressively Calvinistic aunt, he was morbidly afraid of death and morbidly eager for religious certainty. As a student of Whewell at Cambridge, he had read Lucretius, Buffon, Lamarck, and Laplace, and formed a life-long interest in scientific thought and discovery.[6] In 1833 his close friend Arthur Hallam died at the outset of an apparently brilliant career. Tennyson's deep-seated fear of death was provided with a locus and an object. Was there a benevolent governance to this unsatisfactory universe, a personal immortality after death? Pen in hand, Tennyson ruminated for seventeen years and, among other poems, produced "The Two Voices" and *In Memoriam*. Early in his ruminations, in 1837, he read Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology*.[7] To the abyss of space, Lyell added an abyss of time, and filled it with the Darwinian facts of struggle for survival and extinction of species. He did not, of course, present the possibly consoling fact of upward evolution. That Tennyson seems to have got from R. W. Chambers' *Vestiges of Creation*, first published in 1844. At any rate, Lyell documented Tennyson's darkest fears. What we remember best from *In Memoriam* is the nightmare nature "red in tooth and claw" which replaced Wordsworth's benevolent teacher and companion. Actually, the poem is a museum of the significances of the term: we encounter nature as mechanism, as violence and death, as proliferation and waste, as disfiguring decay, as endless change, as the "ape and tiger" within man, as pathetic fallacy, as beauty and consolation, as the visible manifestation of platonic soul and of departed spirits as well as of Divine Love and Law, and of human and cosmic progress or evolution moving toward a far-off divine event.[8] The poem presents a rather contrived victory. Tennyson decides, not so much that the Universe is good, as that it is better than he had thought, and may eventually become perfect. The vision of death, personal and scientific, is dispelled by a clamor of Christmas and marriage bells.

Lyell had familiarized Tennyson with nature as futile abundance and ferocious struggle. Laplace and Chambers had provided him with concepts of evolution. Actually, the nebular hypothesis remained his favorite symbol of upward progress or development:

> Yet I doubt not thro' the ages
> one increasing purpose runs,
> And the thoughts of men are widened
> with the process of the suns.[9]

Tennyson had thus faced Darwinian realities before *The Origin of Species* appeared in 1859. When Darwin called on him at Farringford in 1868, Tennyson said, "Your theory of Evolution does not make against Christianity," and received the almost too reassuring reply, "Certainly

[5] Tennyson, Alfred, *In memoriam*, poem 3.

[6] Stevenson, Lionel, *Darwinism among the poets*, 57–59, Chicago, Univ. Press, 1932.

[7] *Ibid.*, 60.

[8] Poems 3, 5, 55, 56, 97, 106, 109, 111, 118, 120, 123, 124, 126, 130 & epilogue.

[9] Locksley Hall, ll. 136–137.

not." [10] Tennyson was no doubt haunted by *The Origin*, but he did not fully accept it. He seems like Lyell to have remained complexly undecided all his life, steadfast only in regarding man as a creature who was distinguished by a supernatural principle and who fulfilled it by putting down the "ape and tiger" within him.

In a world that grew steadily more Darwinian Tennyson grew steadily more pessimistic. At times he ventured on a thin and timid transcendentalism. *"De Profundis"* preaches the platonic descent of the soul from eternity: the child develops finitely and mortally in the flesh, infinitely and immortally in the spirit. "The Ancient Sage" discovered the Absolute in the cautious anonymity of "the Nameless," who sustains the phenomenal world like the Berkeleyan God and who speaks in the depths of the self intuitive truth which must be heeded above reason and the senses.[11] But on the whole Tennyson was reluctant to climb into the soft cotton wool of transcendentalism which protected Carlyle and, to a lesser degree, Browning, from the sharp edges of both scientific fact and Christian dogma. The impact of post-Tennysonian progress on a morose temperament produced inward gloom and outward cynicism: in his old age Tennyson frequently sounded like a very formidable Diogenes looking out of a rather luxurious tub. From the naturalistic premises of Darwin and the skeptical premises of Hume, he drew with scandalized outcries the hedonistic conclusions of Walter Pater.[12] In *The Promise of May* his villain Edgar discusses sensational automatism in man and blind cruelty in nature while seducing a country maid. In the monologue "Lucretius," the hero pays for a too deep knowledge of nature with brutalizing sex-hallucinations, and commits suicide because he lacks a restraining faith in the gods.

*The Origin of Species* affected people variously according to the interests and convictions they brought to it. It discouraged orthodox believers because it undermined Genesis. It discouraged all theists because it undermined the argument for benevolent design in nature, explaining evolution according to principles which seemed, even to many biologists, a combination of chance, blind mechanism, and ruthless cruelty. In each generation, a species forces murderous competition on itself by vastly over-populating its environment. Individuals vary "accidentally" not only in hardihood, but in basic structure. Favorable variations in stamina and structure are preserved simply because the vast majority of the less fit does not survive long enough to mate, or at least to mate very often. Baldly stated, Darwinism means evolution by the mass slaughter of failures.

On the other hand, it did mean the preservation of success; it did mean evolution—for the most part, upward; it did mean a spectacular advance in scientific progress. For these reasons, it produced confidence and optimism, particularly at first, among many rationalists and utilitarians. Of these the crassest was the influential philosopher Herbert Spencer. He valued *The Origin* partly because he felt he had discovered all its best ideas for himself long since and partly because he saw in it—as Darwin did not—confirmation of his own general system. Spencer held that evolution and progress were much the same thing, moving from interstellar chaos up to a rugged individualism like his own.[13] He rejoiced in natural selection, not because it was cruel but because it was realistic and Victorian. How reassuring to find that the universe was built on sound business principles! A much wiser philosopher of progress was Walter Bagehot. He did not expect evidence of benevolence or design in the natural order, and therefore was apparently not disturbed in his religious convictions by *The Origin*. In *Physics and Politics*, first published as a series of articles beginning in 1867, he brilliantly applies the principle of natural selection to human societies, and shows how the universal war of savage life evolves into the rational peace of a high civilized community like the British, in which even constitutional issues may be decided by parliamentary debate.

But of all those to whom *The Origin* was a gospel of hope, the most notable, and perhaps in the long run, the most influential, was the biologist Thomas Huxley. In his hands Darwinian doctrine became a sword of realism with which to shatter the great conspiracy of reticences and decencies, pieties and hypocrisies, by which Victorians lived righteously as ostriches in the strange new world they were so busily building up. Huxley's career had prepared him for his destiny. Sitting long hours in church as a boy, he acquired a zeal for the evangelical virtues and an animosity

[10] Tennyson, Hallam, *Alfred Lord Tennyson, a memoir* 2: 57, New York, Macmillan, 1898.

[11] See Beach, *op. cit.*, 426.

[12] See Tennyson's short poem, By an evolutionist.

[13] Somervell, D. C., *English thought in the nineteenth century*, 3rd ed., 137, London, Methuen, 1936.

against evangelical clergymen. At sixteen, he implemented that animosity by becoming an agnostic. At thirty-four, as a superhuman young professor of natural history, he read *The Origin*, accepted evolution, and cautiously admitted natural selection as a tentative hypothesis. In the great controversy that followed, Huxley forgot all his caution and most of his tentativeness. Darwin had found his Paul. Huxley acclaimed the great book as a sweeping stride in the triumphant march of scientific progress, as a commanding generalization illuminating the unity of nature, and as a convincing scientific alternative to the obstructive fables of Genesis. In *Man's Place in Nature* (1863), brushing aside the scruples of Lyell and Tennyson, he hastened to prove that man was simply a more intelligent ape who had begun to progress in civilization by learning to speak and to obey some instincts and control others. At this time he seems to have believed that man needed self-control and virtue not only to progress, but to maintain his total bodily and moral health. Apparently, the natural order had a moral dimension, and excess of whatever kind had its penalties. In a famous letter to Kingsley (1860), Huxley had declared that in this life "the wicked does *not* flourish nor is the righteous punished. . . . As we live, we are paid for living."[14] Clearly, Huxley had accepted the universe with a vengeance.

In "The Physical Basis of Life" (1868), Huxley reduced man, along with the rest of living nature, to the breath-taking simplicity of a substance called protoplasm. Thought itself is but molecular change in protoplasm. Obviously, intellectual progress depends on the victory of matter and causation over spirit and spontaneity. To be sure, the author introduced a subtle doubt as to what matter and causation were, but most people forget the subtlety in the exhilarating, convention-crushing simplicity of the essay. Anything so clear and eloquent could scarcely fail to be influential.

Through the sixties and seventies Huxley continued to wage multifarious war against earth and heaven, building Darwinism on the ruins of Genesis and creationism, and clearing a space for scientific education along the battered edges of the classical curriculum. Yet he was by no means too busy or too angry to think. Both his own political studies and several recent books might have led him to reconsider the larger implications of evolution by natural selection. In his *Candid Examination of Theism* (1876), G. J. Romanes had documented the famous lines of *In Memoriam* with a biologist's indictment of nature for torture, murder, and other crimes. In one of his *Three Essays on Religion*, posthumously published in 1874, John Stuart Mill had devastatingly explored the whole relation of nature to morality and theism. Asked to give the second Romanes lecture at Oxford for 1893, Huxley seized the opportunity to face once more the problem of man's place in nature. Though now sixty-seven and in ill health, he was as usual all courage and decision, all clarity and good sense. Two processes obtain in the universe: the cosmic and the ethical: The first plunges all sentient beings into a welter of change, an ordeal of struggle, suffering, and death; the second has enabled man to live in comparative harmony with his fellow man and to become the dominant animal on the planet. Only partially emancipated from nature, he still suffers pain, still battles the ape and tiger within him. Nevertheless, Huxley concluded, "I see no limit to the extent to which intelligence and will, guided by sound principles of investigation and organized in conscious effort, may modify the conditions of existence, for a period longer than that now covered by history."[15] This sentence might be understood to involve many expedients, such as socialism, with which Huxley was not in sympathy. "Evolution and Ethics" does in fact give powerful support to those who, like Ruskin, had begun to attack competition as a social and economic doctrine. Huxley had as usual cut the Gordian knot, and left the broken strands for lesser men to ravel up. The lecture shows, besides its insistence on waste and cruelty in nature, other marks of late nineteenth-century pessimism: there is something of Hardy's hostility to the universe, something of Pater's preoccupation with the swiftness and complexity of experience. Yet the suggestion that man could in great degree make his own environment was profound and courageous. Huxley had given the doctrine of progress fresh vitality and definition.

*The Origin of Species* had clearly indicated that man was an animal. Those who accepted this proposition were confronted with the ancient naturalistic alternatives: man should seek his destiny or happiness in terms either of epicurean

[14] Huxley, Leonard, *Life and letters of Thomas Henry Huxley* 1: 233-239, New York, D. Appleton, 1901.

[15] Evolution & ethics, *Evolution & ethics and other essays*, authorized ed., 85, New York, D. Appleton, 1897.

pleasure or of stoic reason. Swinburne and Pater tended to the first; Huxley and Matthew Arnold clearly embraced the second. Meredith, Butler, and Shaw injected a little of the first into a great deal of the second.

But even as an animal, man looked very different from different perspectives. Evolution and progress can do much for low origins, and they can promise even more. Stultifying aggressive creationists in the sixties, Huxley had proved that man was an ape. Illuminating pessimistic Darwinians in the nineties, he had emphasized that man was a very remarkable ape, and might even be something of a hero. But if a hero, why not a God? To such nonsense, Huxley himself would not have listened for a moment. Other rationalists, either to conciliate or to shock the Victorian religious sense, were quite willing to regard man as at once divine and animal. Mill seems to have wished to mitigate the free thinkers' crushing sense of isolation, by replacing the community of God with a community of man. In his later works, Comte had propounded a *Sociocracy* dedicated to the worship of humanity as *le grand être*—a faith which Huxley damned as "Catholicism *minus* Christianity."[16] In his "Ethics of Religion" attempting, unlike Comte, to describe the facts of life exclusively in terms of biological evolution, W. K. Clifford had found in man a reality at once older and younger than the concept of God: "From the dim dawn of history and from the inmost depths of every soul, the face of our father Man looks out upon us with the fire of eternal youth in his eyes, and says, 'Before Jehovah was, I am.'"[17] The quotation is strikingly suggestive of certain lines in Swinburne's "Hertha" (1871).[18]

When in the eighties and nineties Tennyson saw hedonistic consequences in Darwinian causes, he was, like so many elderly prophets, denouncing a future that was already becoming the past. Iniquities which Tennyson scarcely dreamed of Swinburne had with headlong precocity already celebrated, and perhaps embraced. He had learned the habit of rebellion from his grandfather, free thought and republicanism from Oxford dons like Nichol and Jowett, art for art's sake from Hugo, and a satanic inversion of values from Blake, Shelley, and Baudelaire.[19] Already in 1866, *Poems and Ballads* opposed pagan hedonism to Christian morbidity, and to Tennysonian domestic love, an eroticism which, pushed to the extremes of satiety, sadism, and the longing for death, seems quite as morbid as anything Swinburne reprehended in Christianity. But of course hedonism in practice proved as debilitating as hedonism in poetry was exhilarating. By way of distraction, Swinburne was introduced to an old hero, Mazzini, the aging but picturesque martyr of Italian republicanism—and the advanced aesthete quite abruptly became a somewhat old-fashioned humanitarian. But Swinburne could not suppress his genius for grandiose paradox and desecration. In its deification of an evolutionary Life Force, his humanitarianism is startling and new.

Swinburne is not, like Mill, concerned with the moral character of the First Cause, or, like Huxley, with the contrast between cosmic and ethical process. In "Hertha," the life-giving mother Earth declares simply that she is "that which began";[20] she is the all-embracing power who reconciles within herself all contraries of subjective and objective, who has raised up life from the depths to man, who has seen his gods arise and perish according to his need, who sanctifies everything but Victorianism:

> I the grain and the furrow,
> The plow-cloven clod
> And the plough-share drawn thorough,
> The germ and the sod
> The deed and the doer, the seed and
> the sower, the dust that is God.[21]

The time for superstition and slavery has passed. Ethically, Hertha preaches "love, the beloved Republic"[22] and freedom in thought and action. In his "Hymn of Man," the poet sings the blind purposelessness of man's early struggle upward, his perils and sufferings, his helplessness before the power of things, his slow victory over them, his superstitious invention of a God who judged him and who now has been judged by him, the free and triumphant reaching out of his mind and spirit into the abysses of the universe. Swinburne concludes, truculently parodying the language of Christian ritual:

[16] *The physical basis of life, methods and results*, authorized ed., 156, New York, D. Appleton, 1896.

[17] *The scientific basis of morals and other essays*, 47, New York, Humboldt, n.d.

[18] Swinburne, Algernon C., Hertha, ll. 11–15.

[19] Chew, Samuel, *Swinburne*, 24, 116–121, Boston, Little, Brown, 1929.

[20] L. 1.

[21] Ll. 36–40.

[22] Ll. 190.

Glory to Man in the highest! for Man is the
master of things.[23]

"Hertha" certainly contains the idea of evolution, and the "Hymn of Man" may contain some hint of Darwinism; but one doubts that Swinburne read *The Origin of Species*. He seems to have read everything but prose.

Swinburne is one of the first great anti-Victorians. Like Huxley, he used Darwinian and other kinds of realism to shatter the Victorian decencies, but to an extent that must have shocked Huxley himself. His erotic poems must have risen on the horrified consciousness of elderly Victorian repression like a dream of lust and obscenity. His poems of natural religion are nearly as full of animosity against the Victorian God as of piety for universal man. He seems almost to have invented one religion in order to destroy another.

Apparently inspired by Swinburne,[24] George Meredith made a much more constructive effort. His mind had been improved by a combination of hard work and hard knocks. For several years a schoolboy in Germany and for many years a professional reviewer, as well as reader for a publishing house, he had an acquaintance, more or less profound, not only with several literatures, but with Biblical criticism and scientific theory.[25] In English literature he was deeply influenced by Wordsworth and Carlyle; in French, by Molière; and in German, by Goethe—and, particularly, by his *"Fragment über die Natur,"* which, at once rapturously and hard-headedly, accepts nature in all her beauties, contradictions, and cruelties. Meredith had lost his religious faith in childhood. Six-weeks' adolescent religious fever had vaccinated him against evangelical orthodoxy for a lifetime. But in him, as in others, the need to believe survived the destruction of dogma. Huxley had more or less unconsciously read moral values into scientific method, and even religious values into agnostic doubt. Meredith made a very conscious and elaborate effort to found romantic nature-worship and Victorian religious experience, somewhat revised and rarified, on scientific and evolutionary fact.

His nature poetry is naively Wordsworthian. One hears nothing of the struggle for survival. The "South-West Wind in the Woodland" (1851), like so many of his poems, makes nature an Aeolian lyre of tree branches played on by the wind. The wind is a definitely platonic wind, carrying aesthetic and religious messages from a beneficent world soul. The "Ode to the Spirit of Earth in Autumn" (1862) depends on the same figure, but now the wind carries intimations of more somber realities—of struggle, suffering, and death. But the man who truly loves nature finds no contradiction between her goodness and his mortality. He lives in her eternal life:

And may not men to this attain?
That the joy of motion, the rapture of being,
Shall throw strong light when our season is fleeing,
Nor quicken aged blood in vain,
At the gates of the vault, on the verge of the plain?
Life thoroughly lived is a fact in the brain,
While eyes are left for seeing.
Behold, in yon stripped Autumn, shivering grey,
Earth knows no desolation.
She smells regeneration
In the moist breath of decay.[26]

Not until "The Woods of Westermain," published twelve years after Swinburne's *Songs before Sunrise* (1871), does Meredith assemble his ideas into a system. The Woods of Westermain are not vocal but still. They are a place of sinister and enchanted beauty, reaching back in time and space, like Conrad's novelette, to a deep darkness, where

All the eyeballs under hoods
Shroud you in their glare.[27]

The key to the woods is first courage and then love. Courage enables the wayfarer to minimize negatives—to withstand attack, endure pain, and accept death. Love enables him to value positives—to share in nature's joyous life, to feel her beauty, and ultimately, to understand her goodness. Indeed, love teaches courage:

You must love the light so well
That no darkness will seem fell.[28]

Love teaches man to see through the surface beauty, ugliness, and comedy of nature into her depths, to see that her "Fount" or motivating power is love and its "reflex" [29] or counterpart is

[23] L. 200.
[24] Beach, *op. cit.*, 470-471.
[25] Stevenson, *op. cit.*, 183-184, 187, 195.
[26] Ode to the spirit of earth in autumn, *Poetical works*, with some notes by Trevelyan, G. M., 177, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912. Here, as with Hardy, I refer to pages in a particular edition because no text with numbered lines seems available.
[27] The woods of Westermain, *op. cit.*, 193.
[28] *Ibid.*, 197.
[29] *Ibid.*, 201.

reason. Love and reason teach enlargement of self and devotion to others. They teach that "Change," or evolution, will bring further enlargement, that

> Change, the strongest son of life
> Has the Spirit here to wife.[30]

Through struggle and natural selection[31] life has evolved from "Blood" or animal ferocity, up to "Brain," and from Brain—through the subjugation of Blood and the enlargement of self—up to "Spirit."[32] Nature attains spirit through man, her highest achievement; and apparently man, when he achieves spirit, may see that life has in its destiny involved spirit from the first:

> Look with spirit past the sense,
> Spirit shines in permanence.[33]

Meredith says all that can be said for nature, and perhaps a little more, too. So much courage and love imply a certain minimum act of faith, and to assert that nature has a beneficent purpose is probably to go beyond strict evolutionary fact—in certain passages, indeed, very nearly to make Wordsworth swallow Darwin. Yet of all nature creeds, Meredith's was perhaps the most realistic, enlightened, and consistent. It was, certainly, a creed for the strong. Some men did not feel so strong—or at least so cheerful.

One of these was Thomas Hardy. Had he lived in the early nineteenth century, Hardy might have rejoiced in the benevolence of nature and hailed the French Revolution as a return to a golden age. But Hardy was young when the commanding book was not the *Émile* but *The Origin of Species*—and when people thought little about the inspiring prospect of upward evolution and much about the clumsy and bloody methods by which evolution was accomplished. Hardy is almost the classic case of the evolutionary pessimist. He found no consolation in evolution or progress, and brooded on the methods of evolution for a lifetime.

Why could he take no comfort in progress? Actually, he seems to have disliked progress—both for romantic and personal reasons. A sensitive, apparently somewhat fearful nature, Hardy had grown up in the tranquil, happy security of village life, and had then faced loss of faith, together with all the problems and responsibilities of manhood, in the deep, distracting solitude of a great and strange city. One can understand why he scorned Philistines, disliked cities, and resented the intrusion of modern progress upon the rural Wessex of his secure and happy childhood. Perhaps civilization represented for him an intellectual and moral maturity which he had accepted fearfully, only half-willingly. Perhaps he simply abhorred cast-iron bridges and lacked insight into tea-party psychology. At any rate, unlike Swinburne and Meredith, he felt no enthusiasm for the intellectual and spiritual achievements of man. In a Darwinian universe, man is a mistake:

> . . . the human race is too extremely developed for its corporeal conditions, the nerves being evolved to an activity abnormal in such an environment. Even the higher animals are in excess in this respect. It may be questioned if Nature, or what we call Nature, so far back as when she crossed the line from invertebrates to vertebrates, did not exceed her mission. This planet does not supply the material for happiness to higher existences. Other planets may, though one can hardly see how.[34]

Here the doctrine of romantic maladjustment is applied on an extraordinary scale. What, in Rousseau or Byron, the solitary romantic genius suffers from a cruelly indifferent society is paralleled in Hardy by what all the higher animals suffer from a cruelly indifferent universe. What is decisive in both cases is the impact of apparently unnecessary suffering on humanitarian sensitivity. Much of what is basic in Hardy's art can be explained in terms of a tenderness and pity which spring partly from fear. The powerful undercurrent of Victorian anxiety came to a climax in Hardy, and openly indicated the moral governance of the universe.

Hardy's attitude toward nature is complex. In a passage of *The Dynasts*, he refines her nominalistically down to a "lay-shape" on which men hang phenomena.[35] In "The Lacking Sense," he identifies her with the laws of the universe, describing her as a blind mother who "wounds the lives she loves."[36] Similarly, in the poem "In a Wood," associating her with the struggle for survival, he reverses Wordsworth and deplores what trees have made of trees. But usually he regards her not as the author, but, like man,

[30] *Ibid.*, 199.
[31] The earth & man, *op. cit.*, 240.
[32] The woods of Westermain, *op. cit.*, 201–202.
[33] *Ibid.*, 200.
[34] Hardy, Florence E., *The early life of Thomas Hardy*, 285–286, New York, Macmillan, 1928.
[35] Quoted in Beach, *op. cit.*, 503.
[36] Collected poems, 107, New York, Macmillan, 1948.

the victim of the cosmic process, and pities her for her suffering. Moreover, as a primitivist, he exalts the natural above the artificial. In his novels, country people are usually better, and even wiser, than city people. Of course, he projects his pessimism into nature, as Wordsworth projects his optimism. Hardy is the poet of autumn and winter, of rain and frost, of decayed leaves and still pools, of perished skylarks and desolate thrushes.

The obverse of Hardy's pity for man and nature is, as I have suggested, indignation against the blind and savage determinism which seems to rule the universe. It is customary to observe that Hardy eliminates anthropomorphism from his thinking. In effect, possibly so; but in practice, he makes his resentment intense and dramatic by projecting an anthropomorphic point of view into heaths, cliffs, animals, gods, demons, and abstractions—not to speak of ghosts and dead men. But mainly, of course, for purposes of irony and execration, he personalizes the cosmic process itself. God is an imbecile; he is dying from the brain downward; he is clumsy and forgetful; he is evil and malignant.[37] Indeed, in the fine novel *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, the "President of the Immortals" is not altogether above suspicion of popping out of cosmic trapdoors in a tall silk hat and black moustachios. In later years, apparently after reading Schopenhauer and von Hartmann, Hardy identified the blind proliferation of nature with the will-to-live, reason with the will-not-to-live, and determinism with the unconscious Immanent Will. The rationalism of science had here eventuated in the rationalism of death.

After Hardy, poets continued for another generation—though in diminishing numbers and in extremer form—to think the same thoughts about the same Darwinian dilemmas. William Watson is a minor Tennyson, making more modest demands on an even more anonymous Deity. Robert Bridges is a more platonic Meredith, reconciling natural selection and evolution with the eternal essences. Robinson Jeffers is a more drastic Hardy, condemning civilization with a more radical primitivism and life with a more passionate death-wish. Lawrence Binyon is simply reticent and impersonal about nature; William Butler Yeats escapes from it into an occult platonism of his own. Meanwhile, in the Conclusion to his *Renaissance* (1878), Walter Pater had explained that conceptual thought is very nearly impossible in a brief life of unique and intense sensations. Accordingly, many poets attempted to think less and to feel more. Form became an end in itself, and the literatures of East and West were ransacked for new styles and idioms. Poetry became irrational, psychological, esoteric, urban, satiric. In short, insoluble dilemmas continued insoluble. Darwinism had contributed to produce an intellectual and artistic climate in which nearly everybody accepted Darwin and hardly anybody thought about him.

In the novel—a younger, more conservative, and indeed more profitable genre than poetry—the greater writers hardly ventured to think till well toward the end of the century, but the lesser speedily capitalized on the sensation created by *The Origin*, ridiculing evolutionists at first, then recounting more or less melodramatic histories of religious disillusionment and despair, and at length—mainly in the eighties—expounding some of the more facile efforts at compromise between religion and science.[38] Of these secondary works of fiction, the most important historically is Mrs. Humphrey Ward's *Robert Elsmere* (1888); the most literary, W. H. White's *Autobiography of Mark Rutherford* (1881), and the best known to posterity, Charles Kingsley's *Water Babies* (1863). Kingsley there enunciated his own doctrine of moral evolution: trout degenerated from salmon because they lost the moral courage to return to the sea.

Because truth is stranger than fiction, science has long been the stepmother of romance and fantasy. As the new world of the microscope may have suggested Lilliput to Swift, so the old world of the remote geological past suggested to Jules Verne his enormously popular *Journey to the Center of the Earth* (1864): clearly, a few common coins of scientific fact could purchase in romance an infinite wealth of excitement, vividness, and verisimilitude. Within four decades, in the work of Watson, De Mille, Du Maurier, Bulwer-Lytton, Allen, and many others, a voluminous popular literature had grown up, drawing prestige from science and in turn conferring prestige upon it. Nineteenth-century man journeyed to the remote future and the remote past—freaks, missing links, Martians, and paragons of the future appeared in the capitals of the

[37] *Ibid.*, 58, 106, 110.

[38] Henkin, Leo J., *Darwinism in the English novel, 1860–1910, the impact of evolution on Victorian fiction*, 76, New York, Corporate Press, 1940.

nineteenth century—always to have adventures, sometimes to pronounce a few words of comment or wisdom. Based on an early biological training obtained under Huxley at the South Kensington Normal School, H. G. Wells rocketed or time-machined himself into the Old Stone Age or the distant future, and from the earth to the moon or from Mars to the earth, to popularize—sometimes incidentally and sometimes more deliberately—discoveries in anthropology and geology, and the principles of evolution and natural selection, as well as his own socialism partly inspired by "Evolution and Ethics," and his own eugenical ideas partly suggested by Darwin and Galton. A generation later, Aldous Huxley drew on the double tradition of the scientific romance and the inverted utopia to produce, in 1932, his delightfully satiric *Brave New World*. Pursuing mainly the implications of the American scene in the twenties, he describes a society of mass production and mass happiness which may have seemed depressing twenty-five years ago, but now, with the threat of universal communism and atomic destruction, seems positively optimistic.

Meanwhile, Thackeray had investigated the follies of idle young men, and Dickens the venalities of lawyers and the greed of Philistines, with scarcely a hint that *The Origin of Species* had ever been written. In her habits of detached observation and in her elaborate psychological and moral realism stressing the importance of environment and the logical sequence of motives, George Eliot may reflect her reading in Darwin and other scientific writers and critics. Yet, so far as subject matter is concerned, one is struck by her reticence more than anything else. Ideas entered the upper regions of fiction in force when two thwarted poets, Meredith and Hardy, attempted success in a more popular genre. Several of Meredith's novels seem to involve his evolutionary scheme, and *The Egoist* in particular finds some of its comedy, and more of its serious significance, in Darwin's principle of sexual selection. In their suggestion of an indifferent universe or a hostile deity, in their determinism of environmental influence, overwhelming passion, and adverse coincidence, Hardy's novels reveal even more clearly his pessimistic evolutionism. They also sometimes use science to reduce human significance to the vanishing point. *Two in a Tower* transpires under the crushing immensity of interstellar space; *A Pair of Blue Eyes* opens out, at a critical moment, on the equally crushing immensity of geological time. Again, both Meredith and Hardy are Darwinian in their willingness to discuss unpleasant subjects, such as the animal instincts, or the legal inferiority of women.

In 1872, Samuel Butler, an eccentric bachelor fascinated with *The Origin of Species*, published a compact little utopian satire called *Erewhon*, in which he set the Victorian Age so precisely on its head that it seemed, from certain angles, to assume a posture of extraordinary common sense. Apparently, one of the most sensible things the Erewhonians had done was to destroy all machines. Assuming a degree of consciousness in everything and arguing from appearances to rational self-interest, their apologist had made a convincing case that since machines show many signs of intelligence, they may one day gain full consciousness and become the masters of men. In reply, another Erewhonian had unsuccessfully maintained that machines were simply extra limbs which man has developed and which therefore raise him in the evolutionary scale. The reasoning particularly of the second Erewhonian is in many ways suggestive of Marx. After *Erewhon*, Butler seized on another idea implicit in his whole discussion of evolution: what if living organs were machines? He quickly saw that in a fumbling, trial-and-error sort of way, animals might "invent" their organs through need, improve them through use, maintain them through habit, and pass them on through unconscious memory. Butler explained his theory in a series of clever books and finally illustrated it in a remarkable novel, *The Way of All Flesh*. By assuming purpose in the first place, he had restored a kind of incremental, cumulative purpose to evolution. Paradoxically, his purposive evolution led him to celebrate, even in civilized men, the advantages of an instinctive, unreflecting wisdom.

In *The Way of All Flesh*, Butler demonstrated that his particular kind of evolution was a powerful chemical with which to destroy Victorian ideas and conventions. Bernard Shaw carried the destruction much further and, exercising his superlative genius for pumping intellectual significance into the clichés of a comic plot, used creative evolution to propound theories not only of ethics and education, but—with some assistance from Darwin and Marx—of history, love, and future human evolution. Shaw's long career embraces both the rise of evolutionary thought to its most

elaborate literary expression in *Back to Methuselah* (1921), and its rapid decline before the awful immediacies of fascism and communism.

To sum up, Darwinism undermined orthodox religion by undermining Genesis, and undermined all theism by placing the whole question of the existence of life on the planet in a light profoundly uncongenial to the humanitarian conscience. An inspiration to both Marx and Freud, Darwin was one of the first, and probably the most important of those thinkers who flooded the Victorian mind with unpleasant realities until it gradually ceased to be Victorian. At the end of the nineteenth century, a desperate and disillusioned romanticism brooded gloomily over the wreck of Victorian hopes, and danced gaily on the altars of Victorian convention. A notable decline in faith in the supernatural created a vacuum which was soon filled by the great secular religions of fascism and communism, which also owed a debt to Darwin. Literature has ceased to be much preoccupied with Darwin himself, but it is deeply preoccupied with a world which he, as much as any man, has brought about.

# SOCIAL DARWINISM AND THE BUSINESSMAN

IRVIN G. WYLLIE

Associate Professor of History, University of Wisconsin

(*Commemoration of the Centennial of the Publication of* The Origin of Species *by Charles Darwin, Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Society, April, 1959*)

THE American humorist Mark Twain, when asked to explain why he wore a white suit, replied that clothes make the man, that naked people have little or no influence in society. Unlike Mark Twain, or his fellow countryman Alec Guinness, Charles Darwin was no man in a white suit. But he was a man who exerted a far-reaching influence in society. If Darwin had done no more than change the methods and assumptions of the biological sciences, and contribute to the general store of scientific knowledge, he would still be an important figure in world history. The impact of his ideas was by no means limited to the sciences, however. His theory of evolution touched off a general intellectual revolution that altered the course of religious thought, re-directed the social sciences, and contributed new insights and slogans to the popular and academic varieties of social theory.

The changes that flowed from the Darwinian revolution were so impressive as to suggest that it had unlimited transforming power. In the words of Bert J. Loewenberg, a pioneer student of this subject, "Evolution germinated ideas wherever it penetrated, and it penetrated everywhere."[1] Just as historians of the American and French and Russian revolutions sometimes overestimated the extent to which these upheavals transformed the societies in which they occurred, so historians of the Darwinian intellectual revolution have sometimes misjudged the outer limits of its influence and overestimated the completeness of its sway. The tendency to exaggerate the impact of Darwinism, especially on popular thought, is nowhere better illustrated than in the claim that American businessmen in the post-Civil War decades rationalized their personal careers and justified their business operations in terms of Herbert Spencer's competitive social version of Darwin's theory of evolution.

Even the most casual examination of American historical writing in the last twenty years reveals the prevalence of the assumption that entrepreneurs of the Gilded Age were not only practicing social Darwinists, but philosophical social Darwinists as well. Intellectual historians who treat ideas in their social contexts suggest that Darwinism served as an ideological shield and buckler for the Robber Baron generation of businessmen. In his Pulitzer prize-winning book, *The Growth of American Thought,* Merle Curti argued that defenders of rugged individualism, both inside and outside the business community, invoked Darwin to justify the struggles of the market place. Herbert Spencer became the oracle of the age, displacing Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill in the defense of *laissez faire.* In Curti's view social Darwinist doctrine "admirably suited the needs of the great captains of industry who were crushing the little fellows when these vainly tried to compete with them."[2] In his study of *The American Mind* Henry S. Commager not only conceded the usefulness of social Darwinism to dominant business interests, but also claimed for the Spencerian system an imperial sway over the minds of most middle-class people in the half-century after Appomatox. "Between them," wrote Commager, "Darwin and Spencer exercised such sovereignty over America as George III had never enjoyed."[3]

Richard Hofstadter's perceptive treatise on *Social Darwinism in American Thought* offered the most systematic statement by an intellectual historian of the case for the businessman as a Darwinist. "With its rapid expansion, its exploitative methods, its desperate competition, and its peremptory rejection of failure," Hofstadter wrote, "post-bellum America was like a vast human caricature of the Darwinian struggle for existence and survival of the fittest." In this

[1] Loewenberg, Bert J., Darwinism comes to America, 1865–1900, *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.* **28**: 339, 1941.

[2] Curti, Merle E., *The growth of American thought,* 568, 571, 640, 641, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1951.

[3] Commager, Henry S., *The American mind,* 87, 89–90, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950.

circumstance businessmen accepted Darwinian terminology "almost by instinct," and discovered that the plausible analogies of social selection were most congenial to their ways of thinking. Hofstadter quoted leading entrepreneurs, among them John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, James J. Hill, and Chauncey Depew, to establish the Darwinian cast of their minds. Depew testified that the guests at the great banquets in New York City in the Gilded Age represented the survival of the fittest, men who had come through the fierce competitions of the great city because of their superior ability, foresight, and adaptability. James J. Hill's career in the railroad industry led him to observe that the fortunes of railroad companies were determined by the law of the survival of the fittest, a conclusion that John D. Rockefeller also allegedly reached as a result of his operations in the oil industry. When Hofstader cited Andrew Carnegie's assertion that competition is "best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department," this bit of evidence seemed almost superfluous in light of the case that he had already built for the captain of industry as a disciple of Herbert Spencer.[4]

Business historians, economists, anthropologists and journalists have likewise portrayed Herbert Spencer as the patron saint of the late nineteenth-century entrepreneur. In the *Age of Enterprise* Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller argued that men of affairs in post-Civil War America found a much-needed philosophy for industrial progress in the Spencerian system. "To a generation singularly engrossed in the competitive pursuit of industrial wealth," they wrote,

> it gave cosmic sanction to free competition. In an age of science, it "scientifically" justified ceaseless exploitation. Precisely attuned to the aspirations of American businessmen, it afforded them a guide to faith and thought perfectly in keeping with the pattern of their workaday lives. . . . Their cupidity, it defended as part of the universal struggle for existence; their wealth, it hallowed as a sign of the "fittest." Business America in the Gilded Age had supreme faith in itself; no wonder it embraced Spencer's philosophy, which sanctified business activities.[5]

So well did this rationale serve the businessman's purposes, according to Cochran and Miller, that he was reluctant to abandon it even after business practices made Spencerianism obsolete. Joseph J. Spengler, an economist who examined the impact of Darwin's theory on economics, shared the Cochran-Miller view that social Darwinism exactly suited the business temper of the Gilded Age. "An outstandingly sucessful business man," Spengler observed, "was hard put to find a philosophical basis for his *apologia* . . . more satisfactory than this essentially perverted form of Darwinism." [6]

Others who have looked upon competitive social Darwinism as a perversion, such as Ashley Montagu, the anthropologist, have insisted that it was a perversion freely indulged in by the business community. Even though in his little book on *Darwin, Competition & Cooperation* Montagu attributed the Spencerian aberration to the impact of social thought and social conditions on Darwinian biology, rather than the other way around, he accepted the idea that Spencer and Darwin supplied nineteenth-century industrialists with a welcome pseudo-scientific sanction for free competition.[7] In *The Age of the Moguls* Stewart Holbrook, a journalist, suggested that business barons purged their consciences by accepting Darwinism. "It was welcome balm to their impaired consciences," Holbrook declared, "to be told they enjoyed their riches simply because of the working of natural laws over which neither they nor anyone else had control." In accounting for the decline of the moguls in the twentieth century Holbrook wrote,

> They became extinct because they were too stupid to comprehend the danger from the changes of the jungle environment which their business methods and their ways of living had helped to bring about. It was full circle. Darwin had explained their origin and prophesied their end. . . .[8]

The fact that the social Darwinist business man has made his way into American history textbooks is but another indication of the consensus that scholars have reached on this question. The

[4] Hofstadter, Richard, *Social Darwinism in American thought, 1860–1915*, 30–32, 34, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945 (hereafter cited as *Social Darwinism*).

[5] Cochran, Thomas C. and William Miller, *The age of enterprise*, 119, 120–123, New York, Macmillan, 1951.

[6] Spengler, Joseph J., Evolutionism in American economics, 1800–1946, in Stow Persons, ed., *Evolutionary thought in America*, 212, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950.

[7] Montagu, Montague Francis Ashley, *Darwin, competition & cooperation*, 32–33, 46, New York, Henry Schuman, 1952.

[8] Holbrook, Stewart, *The age of the moguls*, 89, 320, Garden City, Doubleday, 1953.

novice who discovers the Gilded Age through Henry Bamford Parkes, *The United States of America*, will learn that Spencer "provided the big businessmen of America with exactly the justification they needed," and that industrialists "learned from him to apply phrases like 'survival of the fittest' to the formation of trusts and monopolies and to regard the millionaire as the finest flower of evolution." [9] In *A history of the United States*, only recently off the press, three leading historians declare that Darwinism explained for many businessmen both their own success and the nature of the society in which they operated.

> The weak went down, the strong endured and became stronger, and society was benefited because the unfit were eliminated and the fit survived. Men who had risen to dominance by crushing their competitors were intrigued and comforted by a doctrine that justified any method that succeeded and proclaimed that wealth was a reward of competence.[10]

The clear implication of the foregoing statements is that the captain of industry was a conscious, philosophical social Darwinist, and not just a tough competitor. The world has known many businessmen, before Darwin's time as well as after, who were sharp in tooth and claw. To put such men down as social Darwinists, in the absence of evidence that their thinking reflected the influence of Darwin or Spencer, would be to deprive the term of meaning. Those who represent the entrepreneur as a Darwinist portray a man who had a conscious Darwinian perspective on his personal success, his business activities, and his general social role. He was a man who not only recited Spencer's phrases, but understood their implications, and perhaps even their intellectual derivation. He was, in other words, a man of the type of Andrew Carnegie. An avid reader of Spencer, Carnegie was converted to social Darwinism at an early age. "Few men have wished to know another man more strongly than I to know Herbert Spencer," Carnegie testified in his *Autobiography*, "for seldom has one been more deeply indebted than I to him and to Darwin." [11] He came to know Spencer extremely well, and during Spencer's memorable visit to the United States in 1882 had the satisfaction of having Spencer single him out publicly as one of his two best American friends. Carnegie's addresses, essays, and books are so full of Spencerian allusions, of references to men like himself who came into the business world as "athletes trained for the contest, with sinews braced, indomitable wills, resolved to do or die," that it would be impossible to deny his Darwinist orientation. Because Carnegie supplied such clear evidence of his intellectual indebtedness he is invariably cited to prove the case for the entrepreneur as a social Darwinist.

What is puzzling, especially in light of the claim that businessmen generally took their cues from Spencer, is that so few others have testified so clearly on this point as Carnegie. If men of affairs explained their personal success and justified their business operations in terms of natural selection and the survival of the fittest we should have abundant evidence on this point. It would be folly to deny that such evidence exists, but it is accurate to say that so far it has not been adduced. The men that historians have called to succeed Carnegie on the witness stand have not only been few in number, but on the whole incompetent as well. In support of their case Cochran and Miller cite only one businessman in addition to Carnegie, the publisher Henry Holt. Holt, like Carnegie, was as much an intellectual as a businessman. A graduate of Yale, he was an author and a scholar as well as a publisher, and therefore not truly representative of the business community in his intellectual sensitivity. Furthermore, he did not testify that he was a social Darwinist, but rather that Spencer had considerable vogue among informed people in England and America in the years between 1870 and 1900. What appears to be a case for the businessman as a disciple of Darwin is in *The Age of Enterprise* merely an elaboration of Holt's point, a demonstration that intellectually sophisticated men like Edward Livingston Youmans, John Fiske, Charles W. Eliot, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Nicholas Murray Butler did read Darwin and Spencer.[12]

[9] Parkes, Henry B., *The United States of America*, 488, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

[10] Williams, T. Harry, Richard N. Current, and Frank Freidel, *A history of the United States* **2**: 58, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1959. See also Thomas A. Bailey, *The American pageant*, 532, Boston, D. C. Heath and Company, 1956.

[11] Carnegie, Andrew, *Autobiography*, 338, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1920. See also Hendrick, Burton J., *The life of Andrew Carnegie* **1**: 239, Garden City, Doubleday, Doran, 1932; and Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism*, 35.

[12] Cochran and Miller, *Age of enterprise*, 124–128.

Hofstader's case, though it relies more directly on business testimony, also leaves room for doubt. Even if we were to accept all of his evidence without question, we would still be accepting a case based on the statements of only four businessmen. Part of the evidence must be questioned, however. The statement attributed to John D. Rockefeller is one he never made, namely that "The growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest. . . . The American beauty rose can be produced . . . only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it." [13] This sentiment, uttered by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. in 1902 in an address to the YMCA at his alma mater, Brown University, may prove that the university-trained son knew how to use Darwinian phraseology, but it does not prove that his Bible-reading father was a Spencerian in the Gilded Age.[14] Chauncey Depew's observation that the guests at the great banquets in New York represented the survival of the fittest is likewise open to objection. Since he recorded this observation in 1922, when, thanks to William Jennings Bryan, the air was filled with evolutionary discussion, we may ask how reliably this statement reflected Depew's thinking forty years before.[15] Even if it mirrored his early thought perfectly, the fact remains that in his intellectual awareness he was no more representative of the business community than Henry Holt. A bookish man, and a Yale graduate in 1856, he was a lifelong intimate of Andrew Dixon White, the historian-president of Cornell University. He also served as a regent of the University of the State of New York from 1877 to 1904. Unlike most post-Civil War men of affairs he moved in intellectual circles, and therefore had ample opportunity to master Spencerian clichés. James J. Hill's observation that the fortunes of railroads were determined by the law of the survival of the fittest is likewise open to the objection that a statement made in 1910 does not necessarily prove that its author took his cues from Spencer in the 1870's and 1880's.[16] To make the case for the post-Civil War businessman as a social Darwinist we need direct testimony out of the Gilded Age.

Such testimony may be available, but so far it seems to be in short supply. In 1888 Henry Clews resorted to Darwinian analysis to explain the displacement of Wall Street's conservative old guard by a young, imaginative group of financiers after the Panic of 1857. "The change was a fine exemplification of the survival of the fittest," Clews declared, "and proved that there was a law of natural selection in financial affairs that superseded old conservatism and sealed its doom." [17] In June of 1899 Henry O. Havemeyer, President of the American Sugar Refining Company, replied affirmatively when a member of the United States Industrial Commission asked him if he believed that a trust or combine represented the survival of the fittest in business. Havemeyer testified that he rested his whole political philosophy on this proposition.[18] Nathan A. Taylor, an independent tin-plate manufacturer, also explained failures in his industry in terms of the survival of the fittest.[19] If Gilded Age businessmen were social Darwinists, they could be expected to give evidence of this fact in their discussions of industrial concentration. Yet in the mountain of testimony piled up by the Congressional investigations of 1889 and 1899, talk of the survival of the fittest is exceptional, not common. And sometimes this talk originated with merchants of ideas, rather than with captains of industry. It was a newspaperman, Patrick C. Boyle of the *Oil City Derrick*, and not an official of Standard Oil, who told the United States Industrial Commission in 1899 that "Darwin's theory of survival of the fittest was never better illustrated than in the organization of the Standard Oil Company; it represents the best element in all branches of the trade." [20]

Sometimes the direct testimony of businessmen revealed only that they were religious evolutionists, not social Darwinists. In the year 1900 the banker Roeliff Brinkerhoff reported that "I am an evolutionist of the Herbert Spencer type, and have been so from the earliest announcement of that theory, and with me it has been a power for

[13] Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism*, 31. I call attention to this error with proper humility since it also appears in my own book, *The self-made man in America*, 84, New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1954. (hereafter cited as Wyllie, *Self-made man*).

[14] Fosdick, Raymond B., *John D. Rockefeller, Jr., a portrait*, 130–131, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1956.

[15] Depew, Chauncey M., *My memories of eighty years*, 384, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.

[16] Hill, James J., *Highways of progress*, 126, New York. Doubleday, Page, 1910.

[17] Clews, Henry, *Twenty-eight years in Wall Street*, 6, New York, Irving, 1888.

[18] United States Industrial Commission, *Preliminary report on trusts and industrial combinations*, House Documents, vol. 1, nos. 476, pt. 1, p. 135, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1900 (hereafter cited as Industrial Commission, *Preliminary report on trusts*).

[19] *Ibid.*, 941.

[20] *Ibid.*, 489.

good, and not for evil." [21] In context Brinkerhoff's testimony indicated that evolution had influenced his religious thinking, but not his social views. In an autobiography published in the year 1885 Thomas Mellon, founder of the Mellon banking fortune, devoted fifteen pages to a discussion of evolution, all dealing with the impact of the theory on religion. He revealed himself to be a Christian and an evolutionist, but not a social Darwinist.[22] Though Mellon believed in competition and *laissez faire,* he found his sanction in classical economics, not in Spencer's *Social Statics.*

The testimony of other businessmen before Congressional committees also revealed the persistent influence of pre-Darwinian economic ideas in the late nineteenth century. When Benjamin Brewster, president of the National Transit Company, told the House Committee on Manufactures in 1889 that there were natural laws of commerce as well as of science, he did not refer to evolution, but rather to the law of gravitation and the law of supply and demand.[23] John E. Parsons, a trustee of the Sugar Refineries Company, invoked John Stuart Mill to defend his views in the same investigation.[24] It was Jeremy Bentham, not Spencer, who was cited as authority for attorney John R. Dos Passos' observation to the United States Industrial Commission that "Society is so constituted that some must suffer. It is the sacrifice that the few are forced to make for the good of the whole." [25] Such usages require that we reconsider prevailing assumptions concerning the extent to which Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner displaced the classical economists as the high priests of *laissez faire.* Even more, they require that we exercise caution in attributing to Darwin and Spencer ultimate responsibility for the competitive social ideas of the businessman in the Gilded Age.

Too often, after an uncooperative captain of industry has refused to identify himself as a social Darwinist, he has been asked to step down from the witness stand, so that a sociologist or economist might take his place. Richard Hofstadter, convinced that businessmen "are not the most articulate social philosophers," called upon a reform-minded University of Chicago sociologist, Charles R. Henderson, to testify to the Darwinian cast of the entrepreneurial mind.[26] "It would be strange if the 'captain of industry' did not sometimes manifest a militant spirit," Henderson wrote in 1896, "for he has risen from the ranks largely because he was a better fighter than most of us. Competitive commercial life is not a flower bed of ease, but a battle field where the 'struggle for existence' is defining the industrially fittest to survive." [27] All this statement proved was that Henderson, an intellectual, had the ability to see Darwinian meaning in the struggles of the business world. He did not pretend that the businessman saw his activities in the same light. In fact he deplored the ideological gulf that separated the entrepreneur from the social theorist, and acknowledged that businessmen did not hold the intellectual in high esteem. "They say, with some touch of contemptuous sarcasm and cynicism," Henderson wrote, "that they can hire talkers and buy books." [28]

Gilded Age businessmen were not sufficiently bookish, or sufficiently well educated, to keep up with the changing world of ideas. As late as 1900, 84 per cent of the businessmen listed in *Who's Who in America* had not been educated beyond high school.[29] Though college men in business increased steadily in the last decades of the nineteenth century, they were always a minority. The uneducated majority had little time for books. Cornelius Vanderbilt, who read only one book in his life, *Pilgrim's Progress,* after he was seventy years of age, once remarked that if he had taken time to learn education he would not have had time to learn anything else. Many an unlettered businessman undoubtedly shared this view, and also subscribed to Daniel Drew's opinion that "Book learning is something, but thirteen million dollars is also something, and a mighty sight more." [30] Since in the late nineteenth century Darwin's adherents were for the most part scientists, social scientists, philosophers, clergymen, editors, and other educationally advantaged persons, it would be surprising to find a

[21] Brinkerhoff, Roeliff, *Recollections of a lifetime,* 342, Cincinnati, Robert Clarke, 1900.

[22] Mellon, Thomas, *Thomas Mellon and his times,* 568–583, Pittsburgh, W. G. Johnson, 1885.

[23] Committee on Manufactures, House of Representatives, *Report in relation to the Sugar Trust and Standard Oil Trust,* 50th Congress, p. 372, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1889 (hereafter cited as Committee on Manufactures, *Sugar Trust and Standard Oil Trust*).

[24] *Ibid.,* 54.

[25] Industrial Commission, *Preliminary report on trusts,* 1156.

[26] Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism,* 30–31.

[27] Henderson, Charles R., Business men and social theorists, *Amer. Jour. Sociology* **1**: 385, 1896.

[28] *Ibid.,* 386.

[29] Dexter, Edwin G., A study of 20th century success, *Popular Science Monthly* **61**: 248, 1902.

[30] White, Bouck, *The book of Daniel Drew,* 309–310, Garden City, Doubleday, 1937.

really large contingent of businessmen in his camp. The minority of college graduates and devotees of self-culture may be found there, but the untutored majority probably will not.

Scholars whose work requires them to deal with ideas in a systematic way, and to keep abreast of changing modes of thought, are generally reluctant to concede that other men may be far behind the times, and philosophically disorganized and inconsistent as well. To them it is unthinkable that any influential body of men in the Gilded Age should have failed to embrace the most advanced idea of that age, and that businessmen in particular could have ignored a formulation like that of Spencer, which seemed to explain so many hard facts of business life. However, there is considerable wisdom in the observation that "It must not be thought that Social Darwinism made brutal misanthropists of the Great Entrepeneurs and the Finance Capitalists. They were, by and large, too simple-minded for that; it was only an intellectual like W. G. Sumner who became a misanthropist." [31] Though John D. Rockefeller might transact business according to the law of the jungle, he was a pious Christian who looked upon his wealth as a God-given reward for virtue. Railroad executives, who by certain reckonings were social Darwinists, sometimes violated Spencerian efficiency by decreeing that in slack times single men should be fired first, to be followed by men with the least seniority.[32] Andrew Carnegie, a secular-minded man and a tough-minded Darwinian, was also a generous philanthropist who gave a practical demonstration of the social utility of the old Christian doctrine of the stewardship of wealth. Robert Harris, whose job as president of the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy Railroad might have been expected to put him on the side of the survival of the fittest, testified that "As a general proposition, it seems to me that the strong should help the weak, now by one course and now by another; and in exercising authority to do it as we would wish it done to ourselves." [33]

Anyone who examines the voluminous nineteenth-century literature of business success cannot fail to be impressed that businessmen who talked about success and failure took their texts from Christian moralists, not from Darwin and Spencer. In the race for wealth they attributed little influence to native intelligence, physical strength, or any other endowment of nature, and paramount influence to industry, frugality, and sobriety—simple moral virtues that any man could cultivate. They urged young men to seek the business way of life in the Bible, not in *The Descent of Man* or *The Principles of Sociology*. The problem of success was not that of grinding down one's competitors, but of elevating one's self—and the two were not equivalent. Business practice may have suggested a Darwinian struggle for existence, but self-help advisers of the Gilded Age suggested that the only struggle of consequence was the struggle for good character. Failure was likewise attributed to defective character rather than to deficiencies of endowment or opportunity. Opportunities for success, like opportunities for salvation, were limitless; heaven could receive as many as were worthy. Because American businessmen operated in a land blessed with an abundance of resources they rejected the Malthusian idea that chances were so limited that one man's rise meant the fall of many others. Theirs was a more optimistic view, that every triumph opened the way for more.[34] Advanced thinkers might explain both success and failure in terms of social Darwinism, but most businessmen were probably inclined to follow the lead of the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* in permitting "this fashionable philosophy . . . to spin its shining web and to apply its specious theories where it can." [35]

In order to deprive the captain of industry of the public relations advantage he enjoyed when he passed himself off as a model of virtue, critics of business in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries represented that the great barons were robber barons who knew no moral law except that of the jungle. They inverted the businessman's moral pyramid and tried to demonstrate that he owed his success not to simple Christian virtues, but to brutality, rapacity, dishonesty, and cunning. Augustus Tack, a petroleum refiner who had been squeezed out by Standard Oil, gained a measure of revenge in 1889 when he described Rockefeller as a heartless Darwinist to the House Committee on Manufactures. Tack testified that he had gone to Rockefeller, hoping for a reprieve, but that he had been sent away with the brutal comment, "There is no hope. . . . The weakest must go first." [36] Henry Demarest Lloyd, that erstwhile

[31] Baldwin, Leland D., *The stream of American history* **2**: 248, New York, American Book, 1952.

[32] Cochran, Thomas C., *Railroad leaders, 1845–1890*, 174, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] Wyllie, *Self-made man*, 83–87.

[35] *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* **19**: 361–362, October 10, 1874.

[36] Committee on Manufactures, *Sugar Trust and Standard Oil Trust*, 215.

critic of Rockefeller and student of Standard Oil, observed in *Wealth Against Commonwealth* that "The man who should apply in his family or his citizenship this 'survival of the fittest theory' as it is practically professed and operated in business would be a monster, and would be speedily made extinct, as we do with monsters." [37] When John D. Rockefeller, Jr. made his unfortunate remarks about the American Beauty rose in 1902 he discovered that he had played into the hands of his father's enemies as well as his own. Critics who denounced him as "a young scion of wealth and greed, possessed of more dollars than ideas," forgot that the title of his talk had been "Christianity in Business," and that he had entered a plea for more Christian virtue in the transaction of business.[38] In the spring of 1905, at the height of the "tainted money" controversy, his father's enemies depicted the senior Rockefeller, pruning shears in hand, cutting away the buds that had grown up around the finest flower of the oil industry.[39]

Rockefeller was not the only businessman to be tarred with the brush of social Darwinism in the era of the muckrakers. In his criticism of the men who organized the Beef Trust, Charles Edward Russell explained that "They have merely followed to its logical conclusion the idea of the survival of the fittest, the right of the strong to annihilate the weak, the theory that in business any advantage is fair—the accepted creed of inordinate gain." [40] All the leading muckrakers sensed that there was no better way to discredit a businessman than to portray him as a renegade of the jungle. In light of the eagerness of early twentieth-century critics to condemn the entrepreneur as a Spencerian, it is ironic that sympathetic students of business in our own time have tried so hard to link the businessman to social Darwinism.

There is reason to believe that this mode of interpretation is changing. In his 1953 study of *Railroad Leaders, 1845–1890*, Thomas C. Cochran stated the case for social Darwinism more cautiously, and with greater awareness of exceptions and complexities than in his earlier *Age of Enterprise*. Though he still argued that railroad executives more or less consciously subscribed to Spencerian ideas, he conceded that few of them read Spencer, and indicated instances in which they violated Darwinist precepts in word and deed.[41] My own *Self-Made Man in America*, published in 1954, directly challenged prevailing assumptions on this question. In *Dream and Thought in the Business Community*, published three years ago, Edward C. Kirkland suggested that Darwinism may have done no more than furnish new terms for old ideas in the years after Appomatox, and that businessmen may have derived their ideas of competition and survival from experience and observation, rather than from Spencer.[42]

In the years ahead we can look forward to a more complete and discriminating appraisal of the businessman's acceptance of social Darwinism. Greater awareness of the weaknesses of the old assessment will contribute to the strengthening of the new. In the future historians will distinguish between representative and unrepresentative views, between the ideas of an intellectually unsophisticated majority and those of an educated, bookish minority. They will also discriminate between positive social Darwinists and mere biological or religious evolutionists. They will ask whether competitive social Darwinism did fit the businessman like a glove, whether it served all of his interests and satisfied his every aspiration. Was he a Spencerian when he cooperated with other businessmen in pools and trusts that throttled competition? What did he contribute to the survival of the fittest when he practiced philanthropy? From a public relations point of view, who profited more from the claim that he was a social Darwinist, the businessman or his critics? As historians undertake to explain what the businessman actually thought about social Darwinism they will recognize that their greatest single need is a need for more direct, reliable evidence on all the points at issue. This means evidence out of the Gilded Age, and evidence supplied by businessmen themselves, not by outside observers. It also means testimony that leaves little or nothing to inference, testimony that ties ideas to their actual and not their assumed sources. My prediction is that such evidence will force us to revise downward our estimate of the impact of social Darwinism on American business thought. The businessman drew his ideas and social values from many sources, not just one. He would not have been ideologically naked without the Spencerian formulation.

[37] Lloyd, Henry Demarest, *Wealth against commonwealth*, 495, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1899.

[38] Fosdick, *John D. Rockefeller, Jr.*, 130–131.

[39] Nevins, Allan, *John D. Rockefeller* 2: 545, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.

[40] Russell, Charles Edward, The greatest trust in the world, *Everybody's Magazine* 12: 643, May, 1905.

[41] Cochran, *Railroad leaders*, 173–174.

[42] Kirkland, Edward C., *Dream and thought in the business community, 1860–1900*, 13–14, 18, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1956.

# SPECIES BEFORE DARWIN

CONWAY ZIRKLE

Professor of Botany, University of Pennsylvania

(*Commemoration of the Centennial of the Publication of* The Origin of Species *by Charles Darwin, Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Society, April, 1959*)

IN ANY association test given to a literate person, the name of Charles Darwin would almost certainly elicit the word "evolution." A biologist might go further and reply "evolution by means of natural selection." And, in this, the nineteen hundred and fifty-ninth year of man's salvation and the hundredth since the publication of Darwin's great work, almost any scholar might reply, *"The Origin of Species."* Darwin showed by the title that he chose for his book that the validity of his theory of evolution depended upon the mutability or non-mutability of the units that the systematists have labeled "species." He knew that, if he could prove that species evolved, he would prove also that no logical limit could be set to the process and that genera, families, and orders must also evolve. But evolution on the sub-species level did not imply necessarily that the whole organic world had reached its present state through the process of evolution, i.e. through a natural and continuous proliferation of new and original forms.

At the time of Darwin, the crucial point in any general theory of evolution was the stability or instability of species. To the biologists of 1859, changes in such subordinate units as races and varieties seemed unimportant. Varieties, they thought, could be altered by even trivial changes in the environment but this mutability showed only that life itself was labile and that living forms could adapt themselves to routine contingencies. The universally held belief in the inheritance of acquired characters made it easy for the biologists to look upon these varietal adaptations as heritable and to admit that evolution did occur on the sub-species level. But most of them continued to believe that the species themselves owed their origin to special and individual acts of creation. There was, in fact, no logical contradiction between a belief in a limited system of evolution and a belief in special creation. The very theologians who thought that all human beings were descended from Adam, had to believe in a partial evolution, that is, in human evolution on the racial level, for they had only to look at the different races of men to see that they differed from one another and that the differences were inherited.

Thus the evolutionists at the time of Darwin had only to show that the mutability that was so obvious on the varietal level extended beyond varieties. Darwin's young friend, Alfred Russell Wallace, who developed the concept of natural selection independently, showed this by the title he chose for his paper—the paper that he presented jointly with Darwin at the famous meeting of the Linnaean Society. It was entitled, "On the tendency of varieties to depart indefinitely from the original type." In the Darwin-Wallace view, species were merely varieties that had been altered so greatly that they had passed the point of no return. To most of their contemporaries, however, this view was truly revolutionary, for the whole taxonomic framework of the mid-nineteenth century was based on the assumed stability of species.

The biologists, however, had not always believed that species were stable. Indeed, the idea that species had to remain exactly as they had been created was relatively new. It had been accepted for only a little over a hundred years when Darwin and the other evolutionists rejected it. A century earlier most biologists had believed that, if one species saw fit to change into another, it could do so, but that such changes were not really important. Anyone who happened to observe a mutating species, however, might be interested enough to describe what he saw, but no one, seemingly, felt it necessary to pursue the matter further. The biologists of the time just accepted at face value the many published accounts of degenerating species, but this degeneration—this generating away from the normal—gave them no inkling whatever of evolution.

The theory of evolution pre-supposes of course that species are mutable, but mutability in itself

does not imply evolution. Species must be able not only to change but to change in an orderly manner and with reasonable systematic limits, before they can be organized into an evolutionary sequence. A scientific theory of evolution, however, requires more than a mere description of an orderly procession of changing species. It needs a rational explanation. If the biologists could not identify the forces that make living things evolve, the theory of evolution would be little more than an intriguing mystique. Unfortunately, to most laymen this is just what evolution is. Evolution could never have attained its present status in the scientific world if the biologists had not discovered what caused it.

Finding a logical explanation of evolution turned out to be no real problem. In fact, two perfectly good explanations were immanent in biological hypotheses that had been stated as early as the fourth century before Christ but, as it happened, those who accepted these hypotheses did not know all that their acceptance implied. It was not until the nineteenth century that these hidden explanations of evolution emerged. Evolution, we know today, would have to occur (1) if acquired characters were inherited and if they accumulated indefinitely, and (2) if individuals varied spontaneously in their hereditary traits and if nature preserved some of the variants and destroyed others.

The first real use of the inheritance of acquired characters to explain evolution dates only from around the beginning of the nineteenth century. At this time, Erasmus Darwin (1794) and the Chevalier de Lamarck (1802) assumed that the results of this kind of inheritance were cumulative, and that the accumulation had no assignable limits. This nineteenth-century application of what is really an ancient doctrine has now become so prominent that the doctrine's earlier and more general meaning is practically forgotten. Today the "inheritance of acquired characters" is synonymous with Lamarckism and, to most biologists, Lamarckism is just a pre-Darwinian theory of evolution.

Belief in the inheritance of acquired characters antedates any records we have of a belief in organic evolution by about two thousand years. We can actually trace it back as far as the Bronze Age myth of Phaëton. When Phaëton, the half-human son of Apollo, drove the chariot of the sun across the sky, the horses ran away and drew the chariot so close to the land of the Ethiopians that it scorched the inhabitants black—a skin character that we know to be heritable, because today the Ethiopians are still black. Centuries later the Grecian scientists accepted this type of inheritance as axiomatic. Hippocrates used it to explain how the Scythians got their long narrow heads, and Aristotle told how a letter branded on the arm of a slave, reappeared on the arm of his son and later on but somewhat blurred on the arm of his grandson. Pliny, Plutarch, Suetonius, Galen, and Justinus all endorsed the belief, which, with such reputable sponsors, naturally persisted until modern times. I have recorded elsewhere (Zirkle, 1946) some hundred instances of its acceptance during the Middle Ages and Renaissance, and also some fourteen instances of its being endorsed by contemporaries of Lamarck. Here we can expend no more time in tracing its history.

We should, however, record the modern deterioration of the doctrine. We know, today, that it has no validity whatever; it is only an archaic error, one that has been discarded by all honest scientists. But a hundred years ago, the biologist found it to be a valuable ancillary explanation of evolution—an explanation that formed a valuable supplement to the theory of natural selection.

The other ancient doctrine that was used to explain evolution has just been mentioned—it is natural selection. To the biologists of today, natural selection is *the* cause of evolution. Mutations may produce new characters; the chance loss of genes in small isolated populations may cause such groups to differ from one another; but these are only subordinate factors. Natural selection is always at work—it is the court of last appeal—and natural selection alone determines which novelties persist and which are destroyed.

At first, Darwin thought that natural selection offered a sufficient explanation of evolution, and it was not until later that he found it necessary to adopt the inheritance of acquired characters as an auxiliary factor. As we know, it is to Darwin that we owe the proof that evolution is the inevitable consequence of nature's selecting certain types and destroying others, but Darwin was not the first to discover the evolutionary implications of this partiality. Lamarck almost got the idea, but he saw natural selection as through a glass darkly. In 1813, however, William Charles Wells described natural selection accurately and used it to show how the different human races had come into being. In 1831 Patrick Matthews actually

explained the origin of species by means of natural selection and, in 1858, Klippart showed how nature could displace one variety or species of wheat by another. In this year also, Alfred Russell Wallace showed how natural selection could transform varieties into species.

The classical philosophers who described natural selection, however, did not use it to account for evolution. Empedocles used it to explain the existence of adaptation by showing how it eliminated all individuals who were unadapted. Epicuros followed where Empedocles led, and Lucretius showed in detail how the elimination of the unfit insured that all who lived were fit. Aristotle, however, rejected natural selection explicitly and accepted in its stead a teleological explanation of adaptation and Aristotle dominated the intellectual world for over two thousand years. Thus, even though natural selection has been recognized, since classical antiquity, it was recognized only as a remote possibility. It languished as an unwanted and somewhat sinful alternative to an almost universally accepted teleology. We know today that, in the biological world, natural selection can account for the existence of what would be highly improbable on a basis of chance. In ancient and medieval times, however, the very existence of the improbable suggested the activity of some supernatural agency. But natural selection kept cropping up. In the second century of our era, Maximus of Tyre found it a useful means for explaining adaptation as did Denis Diderot in the eighteenth. But natural selection was not used to explain evolution until the nineteenth century.

While the teleologists could ignore natural selection, they could not keep it from invalidating a number of their arguments. Once it was admitted that nature played favorites and selected certain fortunate individuals, it was easy to show that the incidents previously cited to prove the existence of design were not chance samples of unselected events, hence it followed that those arguments to support teleology that were based on probability theory were completely irrelevant. Even the teleologists themselves were not true samples of unselected organisms. The mere fact that they were alive showed that they were fit. Indeed, no group of unadapted philosophers could ever contemplate their own unadaptation or argue learnedly as to why it was that they were extinct.

While the concepts of the inheritance of acquired characters and natural selection both existed from classical antiquity, a well-developed and scientific theory of evolution had to await the nineteenth century. At first glance, this late advent of evolution might seem to call for an explanation, especially when we consider that the original concept of species bears a very close resemblance to the one that we accept today. Although this resemblance may be superficial, it is very real. The ancients believed that no species were really constant, but that they all mutated whenever the occasion arose. Species were seemingly just unstable and ephemeral units, erratic and unpredictable. But the ancients had no real idea of organic evolution. The assumed behavior of species was too chaotic to give any rational clue as to their origin.

If we are to follow the devious trail of the species concept at this late date we shall have to traverse some strange country and explore some odd fantasies and superstitions. We can begin our journey most conveniently perhaps by examining the origin of the word.

Obviously we cannot determine what a word means by tracing its etymology, but the origin of a word does shed light upon what it meant when it started on its career. The first scholars who used the word "species" wrote in Latin and, when they switched to their vernaculars, they carried the Latin word with them. Thus, the word "species" in our modern languages is only a bit of naturalized Latin. "Species" comes from "specere" meaning to look at, to behold. The species of an object then are merely its appearances, not its inward essence. Thus the word used to label the concept introduced an uncertainty principle into the concept itself because, from the very earliest times, appearances proverbially have been deceitful.

The word "species" also was used within the framework of the dualistic philosophy that dominated both classical and Christian thinking. In this setting, the appearances of an object—its species—seemed superficial, and appearances were contrasted routinely with some inner reality—with some inner Platonic ideal. Thus, if species turned out to be ephemeral, if they changed erratically into other species, it really meant very little. It was only to be expected. Naturally, in such a setting all species took on some of the qualities of the specious. That a beautiful body could contain an ugly soul was a possibility that no one doubted, and consequently the fair outward appearance of an animal or a man or, in

the intellectual field, of a doctrine might be very misleading and even dangerous. The word "species" had such connotations that, in one of its subordinate meanings, it was synonymous with a phantom or an illusion, a species could be a specter or an apparition.

The species of a human being then were his appearances, they were the attributes of his material body, not those of his immortal soul. In an age when the material was scorned and the spiritual revered, a man's species were naturally subordinate to his inner spiritual being, although supposedly his body and his soul were intermingled and each could, to some degree, influence the expression of the other. The material, while it could limit the spiritual, could not really contaminate it, as St. Thomas Aquinas concluded when he discussed a case of inherited feeblemindedness. The problem that confronted St. Thomas was: Is the soul of a child "traduced" from the souls of its parents? He decided that it was not. He recognized that such diseases as gout could be inherited and that mental deficiency actually was inherited as when idiots begot idiots, but this did not mean that the soul of the idiot child was derived from the soul of its idiot parents. It only meant that the material vehicle of the soul's expression was defective and that only the defective vehicle was hereditary. (Sentences, Bk. II, Quart. 81, Art. I).· The material species of the idiot were like those of its parents, but its soul was its own.

We cannot, in any reasonable time, cover all the medieval usages of the word "species." Two more examples, however, will help us explore the milieu in which the biological term developed and which contributed to its biological meaning. The first is from theology. In the miracle of the Host, when the bread and wine become the flesh and blood of Christ, the species of the bread and wine remain unchanged—chemically they are still bread and wine—only their inner essence becomes flesh and blood. Here in theology the word "species" means the same as the word "accidents."

The second example comes from a widespread superstition, but a superstition that the scholars, philosophers, and scientists accepted routinely, i.e., the belief in the werewolf. This creature, a man by day but a wolf after dark (no modern interpretation please), changed only its species. Its inner reality remained the same; it remained a sinful human soul. Lest this final example seem too far-fetched for a serious paper presented to a learned audience, let me call attention to the fact that the history of science cannot be separated entirely from the history of superstition. Indeed, Lynn Thorndyke calls his great work *The History of Magic and Experimental Science*.

We should now be in a position to understand how erratic and variable biological species were thought to be during the period that preceded the beginnings of our post-Renaissance science. In tracing the history of these pre-Darwin concepts we can begin conveniently with the contributions of Aristotle and Theophrastos. Neither of these —the father of zoology and the father of botany— ever conceived of stable and unchanging species. Indeed, Theophrastos devoted almost an entire book (*Enquiry into Plants*, Bk II) to describing how plants changed their species. He stated categorically that plants changed their species when they were transplanted to a different country, and that the change was caused by their growing in a different soil and living in a different climate. He also noted the difference between cultivated plants and their wild relatives, and he assigned this difference to prolonged and skillful cultivation.

He was especially impressed by the fact that many plants did not breed true from seed, and he noted particularly that no cultivated fruit trees ever bred true. Only by vegetative reproduction —by cuttings and by grafting—could superior varieties of fruit be kept from degenerating. This practice—this reproduction of fruit trees vegetatively—is extremely old; it antedates history. The farmers, as well as the philosophers, knew that whenever fruit trees reproduced by seeds, as they did in nature, they routinely produced new varieties. Thus it seemed only reasonable to infer that species were variable in nature and that they were altered as the time, place, and circumstances demanded.

It would be needlessly repetitive to quote all of the records we have of grafted trees producing seedlings which differed from the parental types, and of the inferences the philosophers drew from this rather common occurrence. One instance, however, is worth citing. Seven hundred years after Theophrastos, St. Augustine used the olive tree to clarify a theological problem. He stated correctly that the seedlings descended from the cultivated olive developed into wild olives. This, he argued, showed how nature worked and how it happened that baptized Christians could beget only degenerate sinners, and how it was that the

children of even holy parents had to be baptized before they could escape from their original nature, and develop into cultivated olives. The virtues obtained through even the most effective baptism lasted apparently only one generation. Moral imperfection, however, was normal for the human stock. It was acquired character, inherited from the sin of Adam.

Theophrastos described how one species of mint changed into another, how wheat changed into darnel, and how one kind of fruit changed spontaneously into another. He even gave specific instructions for changing one-seeded wheat and rice wheat into the more valuable wheat that was in general cultivation. Other classical writers followed his lead. Nicolaus of Damascus, for example, repeated much of what Theophrastos had written, and the poet Virgil told in his *Georgics* how wheat and barley mutated into wild oats. Theophrastos did not confine himself to the plant kingdom but stated that animals mutated more than plants did because, in their migrations from place to place, they experienced many environmental changes while plants grew anchored in one spot. He described, for example, how the water snake changed into a viper when the marshes dried up.

Aristotle did not list as many species changes as Theophrastos did, but he never considered species to be permanent or unalterable units. He believed in spontaneous generation and stated specifically that many kinds of fish, eels, and insects were produced equivocally. Some species, he thought, could not come into being any other way, but others, once they had been generated, could continue their line just like those that had originated univocally. He believed in the most promiscuous hybridization and that hybridization produced new species. He stated that "Lybia is always bringing forth something new [because in that country] animals of different species unite, since owing to the fact that there is very little water, they all meet together at the few places where springs are to be found, and so animals of different species unite." Aristotle insisted that these hybrids were fertile and that the mule only was sterile. Pliny and other writers naturally followed where Aristotle led, and we have many accounts of what animal hybridizations produced. The camel apparently got around and was, by nature, experimental. When it crossed with a panther it produced the giraffe, when it mated with the wild boar it produced the two-humped camel, while, according to Oppian, when the camel crossed with the sparrow it produced the ostrich. The origin of the many varieties of dogs was due, supposedly, to the fact that the bitches were broad-minded and their owners took advantage of this fact. The different breeds were descended from crosses of dogs with tigers, lions, wolves, foxes, and goats. The latter mixture produced the wild boar.

We need not pursue these classical writings further. The coming of Christianity did not bring stability to the concept of species. Today, St. Augustine is actually cited as an evolutionist. He thought that all the species need not have been created in actuality during the six days of creation but that they were merely created potentially and that they could have come into actual being much later. Eight hundred years after St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas discussed the subject in detail and admitted that ". . . new species of animals are produced by putrefaction, by the power which the stars and elements received at the beginning. Again, animals of new kinds arise occasionally from the connection of individuals belonging to different species . . ." (*Summa*. Pt. I; quaest. 73: art. 1: ad. 3).

The Arabs, during the period when they dominated the intellectual life of the Mediterranean World, also considered species to be far from stable. Indeed, some of them claimed to be able to produce new species of plants from graft hybrids but this, like most of their other notions, they took from the classical scholars. For example, their predecessors, Florentinus (*ca.* A.D. 220), Diophanes (*ca.* A.D. 350), and Palladius (*ca.* A.D. 375) (*cit.* Bassos) reported that the orange was a new species and was created by grafting the lemon on the pomegranate (Zirkle, 1951). Ibn Wahshya told how kumquats could be made by grafting oranges on olives, and Abt-al-Latif (1162–1231) described the banana as originating from a seed of the date palm that had been inserted into the corm of the colocasia (*cit.* Zirkle, 1935). Thus, diverse species of plants united and made new species and, in this way, we secured many new and valuable fruits which the earlier Greeks and Romans did not have.

In Medieval and Renaissance Europe, species still seemed to be somewhat ephemeral and a little evasive. The records, however, are far too voluminous to quote, but we may mention the *Opus Ruralium Commodorum* of Peter of Crescentius written in 1305. Peter devoted three

chapters to the cultivated plants that shifted their species erratically.

We will skip the fifteenth century completely and mention only briefly a few of the descriptions of species alterations that belong to the sixteenth. Polydorus Vergil told, in 1531, how good cultivation produced superior varieties and how neglect caused species to degenerate. In 1559, Levinus Lemnius included in his book on the miracles of nature a four thousand word chapter entitled *Herbas Mutationibus* and here he told how varieties and species changed spontaneously and how they could be altered artificially. In 1584, Julius Caesar Scaliger, perhaps the greatest scholar of the century, published a commentary on the work of Theophrastos in six books and in 1556 one in two books on *De Plantis*, falsely ascribed to Aristotle. He treated the instability of species in detail. In 1570, Conrad Heresbach, who wrote on agriculture, described the best techniques for changing the color of carnations. In 1576, the herbalist, Charles de l'Ecluse, told how tulips continually broke from their type and changed both their kinds and their colors. In 1599, Martin Del Rio discussed the question as to how the small grains changed into each other.

We will have to dismiss the seventeenth century rather cavalierly and merely list the names and dates of a few of those who described the degeneration and mutation of species. Francis Bacon (1626), Alphonso Carranza (1629), Thomas Johnson (1633), Giovanni Baptista Ferrario (1633), Johannes Benedictus Sinibaldus (1642), Robert Sharrock (1660), Honorati Fabri (1600), Antonius Le Grand (1672), Sir Matthew Hale (1677), Emanuel Koenig (1680), and John Ray (1686). The number of citations such as these could be increased indefinitely. These are merely the ones that I ran across when I was searching the literature for something else.

Today, it is easy for serious scientists to ignore the records of species instability written by our sixteenth- and seventeenth-century precursors. It is true that these intellectual ancestors of ours were frequently careless, generally credulous and, at times, even superstitious. But they observed accurately and they reported correctly that organic units were basically unstable and that animals and plants did not always breed true. They called all such instances "degeneration," i.e., generating away from the normal. From our vantage point in the twentieth century, we can describe this degeneration in scientific terms and we can now explain most of what our predecessors saw. First, we know that they observed bud sports and even propagated varieties that arose from somatic mutation. Second, they saw the effect of xenia but, of course, did not know what caused it. This is not remarkable, because xenia, or the influence of foreign pollen on tissues outside of the embryo proper, was not explained until 1899 (Nawaschin). Third, they noted the results of cross-pollination but, again, they did not recognize the fact of pollen contamination and, of course, they knew nothing of what it could do to their seeds. Finally, they observed the effects of Mendelian segregation but—and this need not surprise us—they knew nothing of Mendelism. A few of their descriptions of degeneration, however, will show how their accurate observations led to a general misunderstanding. They will also show how their observations helped to preserve the belief in the instability of species.

The effects of xenia are sometimes spectacular, especially in Indian corn (*Zea mays*). Here, when different color varieties are grown near one another the wind cross pollinates them, and grains of many different colors will appear on the same ear. This mixture of colors was described some fifty times in the seventeenth century, but our first record of it is a little earlier. It appears in the *Krauterbuch* of Tabernaemontanus, first published in 1588. Here the author printed rhapsodic descriptions of these ears of many colors, and he gave detailed instructions for coloring the outline drawings that he printed in the text. But the reason for these beautiful ears evaded him. To him, plant sports meant only that the Deity was in a sportive mood. He began his accounts as follows:

> And one sees an especially great and wonderful mystery in these spikes, the Lord God, through the medium of nature, which must serve everyone, disports himself and performs wonders in his works and so notably in the case of this plant that we must rightly be amazed and should learn to know the One True Eternal God even from his creatures alone.

The results, as we have stated, were botanically spectacular. The botanists were duly impressed, and God, apparently, was pleased with his work.

Horticultural varieties, heterozygous for many Mendelian factors will not breed true, and this kind of behavior resulted in a mystery that could be very annoying. It completely frustrated Master James Garret, a friend of the John Gerard who

published *The Herball, or General History of Plants* in 1597. Master Garret raised tulips and he wanted his tulips to breed true from seed. Gerard recorded his friend's frustration:

> Notwithstanding my loving friend Master *James Garret*, a curious searcher of Simples, and learned Apothicarie in London, hath undertaken to find out if it were possible, the infinite sorts by diligent sowing of their seeds, and by planting those of his own propagation, and by others received from his friends beyond the seas, for the space of twentie years, not being yet able to attaine to the end of his travaile, for that each new yeare bringeth forth new plants of sundrie colours not before seene; all which to describe particularlie, were to roule *Sisphus* stone, or number the sandes.

The contamination of valuable garden plants by the pollen of their wild relatives could be both an annoyance and an expense, as is shown by an unfortunate incident in the life of Richard Baal, an incident that was recorded in 1680 by Robert Morison in his *Plantarum Historiae*. At this time it was the custom of English gardeners to buy their cabbage seeds from Holland. They believed that seeds raised in England would degenerate. But Richard Baal was a skeptic. He raised some fine garden cabbages from seeds that he had imported and he collected and sold the seed from his cabbages. The seed, however, produced only the wild and useless *Brassica longifolia aperta*, the wild maritime cabbage. Baal's customers sued him for damages and he had to refund the money he received for the seed and also compensate them for wasting their time and their ground. This episode was also reported by John Ray in 1686 and by Johann Wahlbom, a student of Linnaeus, in 1746. At this later date, sex in plants was well understood, and Baal's troubles were correctly assigned to the vagabond pollen of the wild English cabbage.

During the eighteenth century our modern concept of species slowly took shape, but a majority of the biologists continued to believe that species were only ephemeral forms. The growing taxonomic knowledge, however, showed that species were stable, at least in the time scale that was available to the investigators. A sharp distinction was beginning to be made between varieties and species and, as the century passed, only the former continued to be looked upon as unreliable. Species supposedly retained their characteristics but some indirect evidence indicated that the retention was not absolute. The great Comte de Buffon had shed most of the earlier and more naive views of species and to him species were real units (to Buffon, species were what we now call Genera or even Families), but their numbers, resemblances to each other, and their interaction in hybrids led him to believe that what we may call "Linnaean" species were not completely stable but were altered very slowly as the years passed. He was, in fact, a precursor of Darwin. The idea of the complete fixity of species was beginning to take shape in other quarters, however, and it had become the accepted belief of the theologians. The theologians now held that species remained just as God had made them in the six days of creation—they remained just as God wanted them to be.

Buffon's voluminous *Histoire Naturelle* was published over a period of fifty-five years (1749–1804), and in this opus he occasionally let his evolutionary views shine through. The theologians in the Sorbonne found these ideas objectionable. They took a firm stand and Buffon soon learned of his errors. Buffon was always tactful and he conformed cheerfully whenever it was necessary. He always deferred to the "sublime truths of theology" and admitted that his science was subordinate and he would not offend the theologians again until after he had published two or three more volumes. He retained many valuable perquisites and arranged his life carefully so that he could live comfortably and continue to write.

In the middle of the eighteenth century, Linnaeus revolutionized taxonomy. The knowledge of species and their breeding properties became much more exact. Species *were* found to be stable and, when they changed, they changed very slowly, and over an immense period of time. Linnaeus found that species did breed true but he also discovered that mutation did occur and he listed a number of major mutations. He described what he found in accurate detail and this led to some confusion. Indeed one historian of botany, Edward Lee Greene, devoted a chapter to Linnaeus as an evolutionist, and he quotes Linnaeus to show that he was both for and against evolution. Some historians have missed the complications that faced Linnaeus and have assumed that Linnaeus really believed in evolution and that his anti-evolutionary statements were due to theological pressure. Some have even assumed that his relations to the Swedish Lutherans were the same as Buffon's were to the French

Catholics. This may be true, but it seems more probable that Linnaeus was only an honest scientist who was doing the best he could when he was confronted with a very complex problem.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, belief in the fixity of species prevailed in both the religious and scientific worlds. The causes of this were many. The belief might have been inevitable—a natural consequence of a phase through which our growing science had to pass—but it *was* aided by a couple of historical accidents, by the personal talents and characteristics of certain men who expressed themselves definitely on the subject of special creation and evolution. We need mention but two of these, Baron Georges Cuvier and the Chevalier de Lamarck.

Cuvier was a careful, accurate, and active scientist who soon acquired great prestige among his colleagues. He was a firm believer in special creation and he explained the fossil record by assuming that the earth had experienced a number of catastrophes. Lamarck on the other hand was an evolutionist but, while he was undoubtedly a great man, he was so utterly humorless that he was forever making himself ludicrous. He could not endorse a doctrine without injuring it—without making it appear dubious. Belief in the inheritance of acquired characters had been accepted almost universally for over twenty-five hundred years; it was an ancient and honorable doctrine, but it was endangered and almost destroyed by Lamarck's endorsement. Lamarck's talents for making himself ridiculous have been described elsewhere so they need not be depicted here (Zirkle, 1946). Here we may state merely that the biologists of the first half of the nineteenth century did not want to accept his ideas nor did they want to be associated with him in any way. Certainly no sane biologist wanted to be known as a Lamarckian.

It was not until Darwin showed his fellow scientists that they could be evolutionists without being Lamarckians that evolution was welcomed. By the middle of the nineteenth century the evidence for evolution was overwhelming but the biologists did not want to be called Lamarckians and laughed at. When Darwin wrote, evolution was not so much in the air as it was underground. But when Darwin made evolution respectable intellectually, its triumph was assured. For evolution to be accepted it needed only a rational explanation.

One fact in the history of the species concept should be emphasized. The earlier belief that species were ephemeral and mutable did not promote a belief in evolution. A scientific theory of evolution became possible only after the stability of species had been established. Evolution demands that species change but it demands that they change in an orderly fashion.

Following the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, the prevalent view of species became post-Darwinian, and this is the view that we hold today.

## REFERENCES


ABT-AL-LATIF. 1810. Relation de l'Egypt etc. (tr. by de Sacy). Paris.

ARISTOTLE. 1910. Generation of animals (tr. by Arthur Platt). Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press.

BACON, FRANCIS. 1626. Silva silvarum. London.

BASSOS, CASSIANOS. 1704. Geoponicorum sive de re rustica. Cantabrigiae.

BUFFON, GEORGES LOUIS LECLERC DE. 1749–1804. Histoire Naturelle. Paris.

CARRANZA, ALPHONSO. 1629. Tractatus . . . de partu naturali et legitimos. Geneva.

CUVIER, GEORGES. n.d. Le Regne animal. Paris.

DARWIN, CHARLES. 1859. The origin of species. London.

DARWIN, ERASMUS. 1794. Zoonomia: or the laws of organic life. London.

DEL RIO, MARTINUS ANTONIUS. 1599. Disquistiones magicae. Louvain.

EMPEDOCLES. 1908. Fragments. Tr. into English verse by W. E. Leonard. Chicago, Open Court Publishing Co.

FABRI, HONORATI. 1677. 1st. ed. 1660. Tractatus Duo etc. Nirembergae.

FERRARIO, GIOVANNI BATTISTE. 1633. Florum Cultura. Rome.

GALEN. 1821–1833. Opera omnia. Leipzig.

GERARD, JOHN. 1597. The herball or general history of plants. London.

GREENE, EDWARD LEE. 1912. Carolus Linnaeus. Philadelphia, Christopher Sower.

HALE, SIR MATTHEW. 1677. The primitive origination of mankind. London.

HERESBACH, CONRAD. 1586. 1st ed. 1570. Foure bookes of husbandry (tr. by Barnebe Googe). London.

HIPPOCRATES. 1886. The genuine works of Hippocrates (tr. by Francis Adams). New York.

JOHNSON, THOMAS. 1633. Gerard's herball or general historie of plants. 2nd ed. Edited by Thomas Johnson. London.

JUSTINUS. 1746. The history of the world. London.

KLIPPART, J. H. 1858. Origin, growth, diseases, varieties, etc., of the wheat plant. Ohio. *Annual Report Board of Agriculture* **12**: 568–816.

KOENIG, EMANUEL. 1680. Regnum vegetabile etc. Basel.

——. 1708. Regnum vegetabile. 1st ed. 1680. Basileae.

LAMARCK, J. B. P. A. DE MONET DE. 1802. Recherche sur l'organisation des corps vivants. Paris.

l' ECLUSE, CHARLES DE. 1576. Rariorum aliquot stirpum per Hispanias observatarum. Antwerp.

LE GRAND, ANTONIUS. 1672. Instituio philosophias secundum principia Renati Descartes. London.
LEMNIUS, LEVINUS. 1559. Occulta naturae miracula. Antwerp.
LINNAEUS, CAROLUS. 1779. Systema plantarum. Francofurti a/M.
LUCRETIUS. 1916. De natura rerum (tr. by Leonard). London, E. P. Dutton.
MATTHEWS, PATRICK. 1831. Naval timber and aboriculture. London.
MAXIMUS of TYRE. 1804. The dissertations of Maximus of Tyre (tr. by Thomas Taylor). London.
MORISON, ROBERT. 1680. Plantarum historiae universalis Oxoniensis. Oxford.
NAWASCHIN, S. 1899. Neuen Beobachtungen über Befruchtung usw. *Botanische Centralblatt* **77**: 62.
OPPIAN. 1918. Halieutica (tr. by Mair). London, Heinemann.
PALLADIUS. 1898. Palladi veri illustris opus agriculturae (ed. J. C. Schmitt). Leipzig.
PETER OF CRESCENTIUS. 1486. Opus Ruralium Commodorum. Argentinae.
PLINY. 1602. The historie of the world (tr. by Philemon Holland). London.
PLUTARCH. 1909. [3]Concerning such whom God is slow to punish (tr. by John Philips). Boston and New York, Little.
RAY, JOHN. 1686. Historia plantarum. London.
ST. AUGUSTIN. 1886–1888. Marriage and concupiscence (tr. by Peter Holmes). New York.
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. 1911–1917. Opera omnia. London, Washbourne.
SCALIGER, JULIUS CAESAR. 1556. In libros duos, qui inscribunter de plantis, Aristotole autore. Lutetia.
——. 1584. Animadversiones in historias Theophrasti. Lugdimi.
SHARROCK, ROBERT. 1660. The history of the propagation and improvement of vegetables. London.
SINIBALDUS, JOHANNES BENEDICTUS. 1642. Geneanthropeiae, sive de hominis generatione. Rome.
SUETONIUS. 1899. History of twelve Caesars (tr. by Philemond Holland). London.
TABERNAEMONTANUS, JACOBUS THEODORUS. 1588. Neuw Krauterbuch. Basel.
THEOPHRASTOS. 1916. Enquiry into plants (tr. by Sir Arthur Hort). London, Heinemann.
THORNDYKE, LYNN. 1923–1958. History of magic and experimental science. New York, Macmillan, Columbia Univ. Press.
VERGIL, POLYDORUS. 1531. 1651. Historiae Anglicae. Leyden.
VIRGIL. 1744. Georgics (tr. by Martyn). London.
WAHLBOM, JOHANN GUSTAV. 1749. Sponsalia plantarum. *Amoen. Acad.* **1**: 61–109.
WALLACE, A. W. 1858. On the tendency of varieties to depart indefinitely from the original type. *Jour. Linnaean Society (Zool.)* **3**: 45.
WELLS, WM. CHAS. 1818. Two essays upon double and single vision, etc. London.
ZIRKLE, CONWAY. 1935. The beginnings of plant hybridization. Philadelphia, Univ. of Penna. Press.
——. 1946. The early history of the idea of the inheritance of acquired characters and of pangenesis. *Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc.* **35**: 91–151.
——. 1951. The knowledge of heredity before 1900. In: Genetics in the 20th Century (ed. by L. C. Dunn). New York, Macmillan.

# THE ROMANIZATION OF SPAIN: THE PROBLEM AND THE EVIDENCE

T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON

Professor of Latin, Bryn Mawr College

(*Read November 13, 1958*)

DISCUSSION of romanization in any province of the Roman Empire involves study of a complicated nexus of physical, social, economic, and cultural factors, such as regularly appear in the relations of an imperial people and system with indigenous cultures at different levels of development. Hence its difficulty and complexity, and its enduring, though tantalizing, interest for ancient historians. In Spain such a study is especially difficult, not only because of the gaps in the ancient evidence, but because of the wide variations, even within comparatively short distances, in physical and climatic conditions within the peninsula, and the great differences in the ethnic components of the population at the time of the Roman conquest. The fragmented political pattern of small and often uncooperative communities and tribes, and the differences in other aspects of their development, enhance alike the attraction and the difficulty of the study. For even though the outlines of Roman policy in Spain and of the history of the provinces there are established with reasonable certainty—and the splendid volumes of the *Historia de España*[1] directed by Ramón Menéndez Pidal are no small aid—understanding of the processes of development, interchange, and adaptation which took place requires a series of detailed regional studies, in which close attention should be given to chronology of development, and to the evidence, mainly inscriptional and archaeological, regarding towns and tribes, the assumption of Roman, or the retention of indigenous, forms, and the survival of indigenous social customs and religions.

First, physical and ethnic diversity. The Spanish peninsula is set apart by the Pyrenees, though not enough to isolate it from the ebb and flow of prehistoric movements of peoples. The greater part consists of a tableland, the Meseta, rarely less than 2000 feet above sea level, much of it relatively infertile, a circumstance which has tended to make its population expand toward the edges, and possessing a continental climate. The chief rivers flow across it to the west, while it is subdivided from north to south by the ranges between the great river valleys, and a clearly marked perimeter cuts it off from the coastal regions about the rim. Deep into it run two great wedges: the valley of the Ebro, an avenue of entrance from the Mediterranean side, and the rich southern valley of the ancient Baetis, which, like the eastern coast, was accessible early for commerce in agricultural products and especially in minerals. The coastal strip, of varying width, much of it rich in minerals and agricultural products, divides into an eastern section from Catalonia to Cartagena, a rather rough southern one from there to Malaga and Cadiz, and the western one, fertile, populous and comparatively undeveloped, with a moist Atlantic climate. And in addition there was the rugged northern coast, last to develop, with a wet climate, where our ancient sources note that grain was in short supply.[2]

The ethnic pattern was equally varied, and still in flux when the Romans expelled the Carthaginians from Spain in 206 B.C. From the Bronze Age on, Iberians,[3] perhaps originally Africans, had held the south and east and a part also of the central region, and had extended northward into southern France, while a megalithic culture had flourished in the west. During the Iron Age successive waves of Celtic[4]

[1] *Historia de España*, dirigida por Ramón Menéndez Pidal, 1 (1), Madrid, Espasa Calbe, 1947; 1 (2), 1952; 1 (3), 1954; and esp. 2, *España Romana (218 a. de J. C.—414 de J. C.)*, Madrid, 1935. On the physical and climatic conditions, see Adolf Schulten, *Iberische Landeskunde. Geographie des antiken Spanien* 1, Strasbourg, 1955; 2, Strasbourg, 1957.

[2] Strabo 3.4.18, 165 C.

[3] See Juan Malaquer de Motes, *Pueblos ibéricos*, in Menéndez Pidal, 1 (3) (see note 1), and the sources and bibliography quoted there.

[4] See Juan Malaquer de Motes and Blas Taracena, *Los pueblos de la España céltica*, in Menéndez Pidal, 1 (3) (see note 1); P. Bosch-Gimpera, Two Celtic waves in

invaders (and some Germans with them) flooded in, chiefly by way of the western passes of the Pyrenees. Their tribes overwhelmed earlier inhabitants in much of the center and the west and displaced each other in almost inextricable confusion. Celts of the first wave entered Catalonia, the first arrivals of the second pushed deep into the center and the west, surrounded the Lusitanians in central Portugal, left enclaves in Extremadura, and infiltrated Iberian Tartessus in the south. The tribes of the tableland were mainly Celtic, but on the eastern edge they formed a composite culture which ancient authors call Celtiberian.[5] In the mountains of the north Asturians and Cantabrians, though infiltrated, appear to have preserved their identity; and so too, we may believe, did the Vascones of the Basque country and Navarra.[6] These invaders, individually brave warriors and well equipped with weapons, remained for long but little touched by Mediterranean influences, settled in their small tribes and subdivisions of tribes about their hill-forts. Some, like the Arevaci and the Vaccaei on the Meseta, were still in motion when the Romans came, and the southwestern Celts were in retreat before a Lusitanian revival.[7]

The east and the south were most open to Mediterranean enterprise. Phoenicians, Greeks, and perhaps Etruscans, came to trade, chiefly for metals, silver, gold, lead, and copper, the first from Mastia, and all from both ends of the Sierra Morena. Tin came from the northwest and across the seas beyond, esparto fiber for cables from Mastia, linen from Saetabis, fish and fish products from all coasts. Phoenician and Greek contacts, then Carthaginian control, deeply influenced the Iberians in the south, while Phocaean and Massilian trading-posts carried Greek influences to those of the east and southeast.[8] The results, striking and often charming (witness the Lady of Elche), are described in Rhys Carpenter's *The Greeks in Spain*, Sir Pierson Dixon's *The Iberians of Spain*, and, since 1954, in Malaquer's section of Menéndez Pidal's history.[9] Thus the Romans found Iberian Spain well advanced, economically and culturally, and able, though not without some severe struggles, to adapt itself to Roman urban patterns. Colonization and mingling of the peoples soon began. The conquest of the warlike Celts of the Meseta and of the expanding Lusitanians of the west went slowly, not without many examples of bad faith on both sides, against fitful yet determined and, as at Numantia, desperate resistance.[10] Gradual expansion up the west coast by commanders from Aemilius Paullus to Caesar and through the tableland and up the Ebro Valley by others from Cato to Pompey left only the wild Asturian and Cantabrian redoubt to be won by Augustus, almost two hundred years after the conquest of Spain had begun.[11] Did the gold and iron and recruits he found there compensate for the three legions and the considerable military surveillance that were required for the next two generations?

Two passages from the geographer Strabo and one from Livy illustrate the situation at the

Spain, *Proc. British Academy* **26**: 23–148, 1940 (The Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture, 8 December, 1939).

[5] See Blas Taracena, *Los pueblos celtibéricos*, in Menéndez Pidal, **1** (3) (see note 1): 195–299, and works referred to there.

[6] So Bosch-Gimpera, *op. cit.*, 109 (see note 4); *cf.* Malaquer de Motes, *op. cit.*, 29–31 (see note 4).

[7] Bosch-Gimpera, *op. cit.*, 114–115 (see note 4); Malaquer de Motes, *op. cit.* (see note 4), 26–28; *cf.* 42 ff.; and on tribes and subdivisions of tribes, the names of known *centuriae* and *gentilitates* collected on pages 33–35, note 32.

[8] On the kingdom of Tartessus, and Punic and Greek trade and colonization, see A. Garcia y Bellido, *Tartessos*, and *Colonización púnica*, and *La colonización griega*, in Menéndez Pidal, **1** (2) (see note 1): 279–308, 311–492, and 495–680, respectively; see also, on the Punic colonization, Rhys Carpenter, Phoenicians in the West, *Amer. Jour. Archaeol.* **62**: 35–53, 1958; and on the Greek colonization, Rhys Carpenter, *The Greeks in Spain*, Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr College, 1925. On some Etruscan place-names in Spain, see A. Schulten, Die Etrusker in Spanien, *Klio* **23**: 365–432, 1929–1930, although the results remain doubtful. On the natural products of ancient Spain, see A. Schulten, *s. v.* "Hispania," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*; L. C. West, *Imperial Roman Spain: The objects of trade*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1929; Van Nostrand, in T. Frank, *Economic survey of ancient Rome* **3**: 119 ff., 128 ff., 136 ff., 150 ff., Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1937.

[9] Rhys Carpenter, *The Greeks in Spain*, 1925; Sir Pierson Dixon, *The Iberians of Spain*, Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1940; Malaquer de Motes, *Pueblos ibéricos*, in Menéndez Pidal, **1** (3): 303–675 (see note 1).

[10] On the process in general, see P. Bosch-Gimpera and P. Aguedo Bleye in Menéndez Pidal, **2**: 3–446 (see note 1). Slighter but valuable for its interpretation of the coinage and its emphasis on the colonies is C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Romans in Spain*, London, Methuen, 1939. On Viriathus and the Lusitanian wars, see A. Schulten, Viriathus, *Neue Jahrbücher* **39**: 209–237, 1917; on the Celtiberian wars and Numantia, his *Geschichte von Numantia*, München, Piloty and Loehle, 1933; on Sertorius, his *Sertorius*, Leipzig, Dieterich, 1926. Extremely useful is his collection of sources in *Fontes Hispaniae antiquae*, Barcelona, Bosch, 1922—.

[11] See R. Syme, The Spanish War of Augustus (26–25 B. C.), *Amer. Jour. Philol.* 55: 293–317, 1934.

time of Augustus. Speaking primarily of the southern region Strabo[12] says:

> The qualities of mildness and civil life have come to the Turditanians, less so to the Celts, for they mostly live in villages. The Turditanians, particularly those about the Baetis River, have completely changed to the Roman mode of life, not even remembering their language any more. Most have become Latins, and they have received Romans as colonists, so that they are not far from being all Romans. And in the present synoecized cities, Pax Augusta [Béja] in the Celtic country, Augusta Emerita [Merida] among the Turduli, Caesar Augusta [Saragoza] near Celtiberia, and some other settlements, manifest the change to these civil modes of life. All the Iberians who belong to this class are called "Togati." Among these are the Celtiberians, once considered the most savage of all.

In the case of the old Massilian trading-post of Emporium, a passage of Livy[13] enables us to follow the process in some detail:

> There were once two towns, a Greek and a Hispanic, separated by a wall. . . . The Greek one, set on the sea, had a wall of less than 400 paces in extent, while the Hispanic one, farther back from the sea, had a wall three miles in circuit. Roman colonists were added as a third element by the Deified Caesar after his defeat of Pompey's sons [45 B.C.]. Now they are all commingled in one body, with the adoption, first of the Hispani, and finally of the Greeks, into Roman citizenship.

The parts that thus came together are easily distinguished in the excavated site today.

But Strabo[14] presents a different picture of the northwestern corner:

> Thirty different tribes occupy the country between the Tagus and the Artabri. The country was blest with fruits and cattle and gold and other metals, yet most of the people dispensed with a livelihood from the soil, and spent their time in brigandage and mutual warfare until they were stopped by the Romans, who humbled them, reduced most of their settlements to villages, but improved some by settling them together . . . . Their uncivilized and savage character is a result not of warfare only but remoteness . . . and is lessened now by the peace, and the sojourn of the Romans among them. . . . They have ceased from warfare, for the Cantabrians and their neighbors have been subdued by Augustus Caesar, and instead of plundering Roman allies, take the field for the Romans. And now Tiberius has set an army of three legions over these regions, and has rendered these peoples not only peaceful, but possessors of some civic life as well.

A somewhat optimistic statement of the situation, but it shows how the inhabitants of the numerous hill-forts had been resettled, and centers like Bracara Augusta (Braga), Lucus Augusti (Lugo), and Iuliobriga (Retortillo) had been founded among them.[15]

These relative differences, with quite local variations, continued well into the imperial period, but the general advance must have been fairly rapid. Otherwise it would hardly have been possible for Vespasian, however anxious he was for citizen recruits for the legions, to give Latin status to all the organized native communities of Spain.[16] Pliny, writing before A.D. 79 but using an earlier source, records many towns of Roman or Latin or native status in the

[12] 3.2.15, 151 C, in the Loeb Classical Library.

[13] Livy 34.9.1–3; *cf.* Strabo 3.4.8, 159–160 C. On Emporium and its region, see M. Almagro, *Ampurias, history of the city and guide to the excavations*, Barcelona, Patronato de las excavaciones de Ampurias de las excelentísimas diputaciones provinciales de Barcelona y Gerona, 1956, and the technical reports of his excavations referred to there.

[14] Strabo 3.3.5, 154 C, and 3.3.8, 156 C, from the Loeb Classical Library, with two slight alterations. For good recent discussions of the policies of Caesar and Augustus, see Sutherland, *The Romans in Spain*, 1939; and the colonization and grants of citizenship, Vittinghoff, *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik unter Caesar und Augustus, Abh. Geistes- und Sozialwissensch. Kl., Akad. d. Wissensch. und d. Lit. in Mainz*, no. 14: esp. 72–81, 104–110, 1951. See also M. I. Henderson, Julius Caesar and Latium in Spain, *Jour. Rom. Stud.* **32**: 1.13, 1942, and her review of Vittinghoff, *ibid.* **43**: 138–141, 1953. The primary evidence is inscriptional along with the geographical and administrative lists given by Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* (*NH*) 3.6–30, and 4.11–120. On the administrative regions, see E. Albertini, *Les divisions administratives de l'Espagne romaine*, Paris, De Boccard, 1923. On the development under the Republic, see also Claudio Sanchez Albornoz, Proceso de la romanización de España desde los Escipiones hasta Augusto, *Anales de historia antigua y medieval*, 5–35, Buenos Aires, 1949.

[15] Bracara and Lucus Augusti are listed by Pliny as the chief centers of assize districts or *conventus* (*NH* 3.10), a position confirmed by inscriptions, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (*CIL* 2.2416, Bracara; 4255, Lucus Augusti). On Iuliobriga, see Pliny, *NH* 3.27. Its territory was bounded in part by the *prata* of Legio IV Macedonica, see Garcia y Bellido, *Archiv. Esp. Arqueol.* **29**; 1956, Noticiario, 184 ff. On the excavations, see *ibid.* **26**: 193–207, 1953.

[16] On Vespasian's grant of Latin right to Spain, see Pliny, *NH* 3.30, which is confirmed by the municipal charters of Malaga and Salpensa and numerous other inscriptions. On the development of Spain in the early Empire and Vespasian's organization, the basic study is by R. Knox McElderry, Vespasian's reconstruction of Spain, *Jour. Rom. Stud.* **8**: 53–106, 1918, and addenda, *ibid.* **9**: 86–94, 1919; but see also Sutherland, *The Romans in Spain*, 183–200.

south but no tribes, and Ptolemy the geographer in the mid-second century finds tribal names only a memory of the past. Security there was broken only by raiders from Mauretania or bandits from the Sierra Morena, for Hadrian had to instruct the provincial council on the difference between ordinary thieves (*fures*) and cattle rustlers (*abigei*).[17] The populous western sections, with their ports, fisheries and watering-places, reveal a middle stage between north and south: Towns of whatever status are relatively fewer in the lists both in Pliny and in Ptolemy, and tribal areas form a basis for Ptolemy's listing of a number of communities. The large northern military province shows the greatest variety, from the highly urbanized eastern coast and lower Ebro Valley to the wilder northwest. Pliny names 179 towns in all, but many of the native ones reappear as subdivisions of the tribes, and he adds that 293 communities were attached to others (*contributi*). Considerable urban development took place between the time represented by Pliny and that of Ptolemy, and titles found in local inscriptions show that the emperors recognized it, but tribal communities remained numerous, their chief centers known by significant titles, such as Forum Gigurrorum (market of the Gigurri, the indigenous tribe near modern Barco de Valdeorras) or Forum Limicorum (Market of the Limici, the Celtic tribe situated near Ginza de Limia), though they were all not far from developing cities like Asturica Augusta, Brigantium, Legio, Aquae Flaviae, and Lucus Augusti, not to mention the growing network of roads.[18]

As an example of the growth of native society in Roman dress I cite an inscription of Asturica Augusta (Astorga).[19] It contains two documents. In the first, dated to A.D. 27, two *gentilitates* (such is the term) subdivisions of the *gens Zoelarum*, renew an ancient agreement of guest friendship, and receive each other individually and collectively into what they call *fides* and *clientela*, both themselves and their descendants. The agreement was signed at a place called Curunda through Abienus, son of Pentilus, a magistrate of the Zoelae. Of the six persons named as agents in 27 none have Roman names, e.g. Arausa, son of Belicanus, but the language used is Latin. We have here a native institution, of which several examples are known elsewhere in Celtic Spain, some, as for example the treaty of guest friendship in the bronze tablet of Luzaga, recorded in Iberian letters in a Celtic tongue. In A.D. 152, 125 years later, these same *gentilitates* receive individually into a similar relationship of *clientela*, three individuals of three *gentes*, two of whom are inconsistently designated as Zoelae. But now the signatures are names of Roman type, L. Domitius Silo, L. Flavius Severus, Antonius Arquius, and Flavius Fronto. If among the Zoelae the subdivisions, probably like clans, were called *gentilitates*, only a few miles away, among other tribes, other such subdivisions were termed *centuriae* in a setting that clearly could have no military meaning. The terms may be Latin but the pre-Roman social grouping lived on.

Cultural studies too reveal the fact of great local diversity. Beside Roman divine names and some oriental importations, come names like Celtic Endovellicus in Lusitania, an unpronounceable horror like Vogodonnaegus in Asturica, or Peremusta in Navarra.[20] And if most of the northern epitaphs are written in Latin the designs above them are native. The Burgos Museum provides many good examples.[21]

[17] *Digesta* 47.14.1. On raiders from Mauretania, see Script. Hist. Aug., *Vita Marci*, 21.1. On Baetica as a whole, see R. Thouvenot, *Essai sur la province romaine de Bétique*, Paris, De Boccard, 1940. On the economic development of Roman Spain, see Rostovtzeff, *Social and economic history of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, Clarendon, 211–218, 1957; T. Frank, *Economic history of Rome*,[2] 458–464, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1927; Van Nostrand, *op. cit.* (see note 8); T. Frank, Notes on Roman commerce, *Jour. Rom. Stud.* **27**: 72–79, 1937; L. C. West, *op. cit.* (see note 8); Sutherland, *op. cit.* (see note 10), 201–214.

[18] The basic information consists of the ancient Itineraries (see O. Cuntz, *Itineraria Romana*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1929) and the inscribed milestones, most of which are collected in *CIL* 2. Note also the stations on the road from Rome to Gades on the Vicarello goblets, *CIL* 11.3281–3284. In general, see J. R. Mélida, *Arqueología Española*, 263 ff., Barcelona, Editorial Labor, 1929. On topography and development in north-western Spain, see L. Monteagudo, Provincia de Coruña en Ptolomeo, *Archiv. Esp. Arqueol.* **26**: 91–99, 1953.

[19] *CIL* 2.2133. See the list of *centuriae* and *gentilitates* collected by Malaquer de Motes in Menéndez Pidal, 1, 3 (see note 1), 33–36, note 32. On the tablet of Luzaga, see *ibid.*, 1, 3, 294; 2, 96; and A. Tovar, El bronce de Luzaga y las téseras de hospitalidad latinas y celtíberas, *Estudios sobre las primitivas lenguas hispánicas*, 168–183, Buenos Aires, Imprenta y casa editoria "Coni," Ministerio de Educación, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Instituto de Filología, Sección clásica, Ser. B, Vol. IV, 1949.

[20] See, most recently, J. M. Blásquez Martínez, Aportaciones al estudio de las religiones primitivas de España, *Archiv. Esp. Arqueol.* **30**: 15–86, 1957.

[21] *Museo arqueológico de Burgos*, esp. plates 11–26 (Guias de los Museos de España, III, Madrid, Publica-

If, therefore, the general lines of development are known, the local and regional evidence has to be discovered and presented in its setting. It is in the discovery and presentation of that evidence that much remains to be done.

We do not yet possess a detailed archaeological map of Spain based on careful exploration, such as are available for Britain, southern France, and Tunisia and Algeria.[22] The archaeological maps of the districts of Soria and of Barcelona,[23] though helpful and extremely welcome, are merely a beginning. More may yet be done to identify the sites of ancient localities and to define territorial boundaries, and precise mapping of these would benefit archaeology, topography, and history. For example, the town of Castulo is named in our sources from the time of the first appearance of the Romans in Spain (even before, since Hannibal's wife, it was said, belonged to a family of Castulo), and was known to be situated at the border of the two chief provinces near the important mines in the Saltus Castulonensis at a nodal point in the system of communications. It was placed at Cazlona, a locality not on the map of modern Spain, leaving room for difference of opinion whether it was north or south of modern Linares. Two inscriptions found *in situ* have placed it at Caldona, south of Linares on a small hill to the north of the river Guadalimar. The discoverer adds the remark: "The Sierra Morena is one of the least studied areas of ancient Spain"; while Thouvenot in his study of the province of Baetica says of this region: "Les ruines romaines sont nombreuses dans toute la région, mais n'ont pas été explorées."[24] Here and elsewhere the gap is being filled. Identification of Alcalá de Guadeira near Sevilla as Lucurgentum[25] reveals a romanized native town, one of whose citizens bore the startling name of M. Iunius Brutus. Topographical studies have appeared of the region of La Coruña,[26] and more may be expected. Despite Schulten's great contributions, a well-organized gazetteer with the needs of historical geography in mind is badly needed.

Particularly since the Second World War the use of aerial photography has yielded important results not only in the study of ancient sites but in revealing ancient divisions and surveys of the land. In Tunisia such surveys have made it possible to see clearly the lines of Gracchan and Augustan distribution of land for colonization and settlement. I need only mention work that has been done in Britain, Gaul, the Po Valley, and Dalmatia.[27] It is tempting to think that in areas of extensive Roman colonization in Spain such as the valleys of the Baetis and the Ebro aerial photography might aid in defining the ancient lines of settlement and their relation to the land of the native possessors. In fact, in the case of the colony of Emerita (Merida) the ancient land-surveyors[28] have pointed the way by describing the size and direction of the blocks and the meeting of two different systems, one for the colony proper and one for the prefecture of Turgalium (modern Trujillo), where inscriptions have preserved Celtic divine and personal names. In Spain there is only a beginning: aerial photographs of sites like the pre-Roman "citania" of Briteiros, of Numantia, and Roman sites like Segovia or Emerita decorate the pages of Menéndez Pidal's history;[29] but systematic studies of the land from the air are needed.

ciones de la Dirección General de Bellas Artes, 1955). Some good examples are found in J. Caro Baroja, *España primitiva y romana*, plates 301–305 (Historia de la cultura española, Barcelona, Seix Barrel, 1957).

[22] On these, see Freeman Adams, Tabula Imperii Romani, *Amer. Jour. Archaeol.* **58**: 45–52, 1954; and also, for Tunisia, *Atlas des centuriations romaines de Tunisie*, Paris, Ministère des Travaux Publiques, des Transports et de Tourisme, Institut Géographique National, 1954.

[23] *Carta arqueológica de España. Soria*, por B. Taracena Aguirre, Madrid, Consejo superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Diego Velásquez, 1941; *Barcelona*, por M. Almagro Basch, J. de C. Serra Rafols and J. Colominas Roca, Madrid, Consejo superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Diego Velásquez, 1945. See also the Carta de Coruña romana, by L. Monteagudo, *Emerita* **19**: 292 ff., 1951.

[24] P. Spranger, Zur Lokalisierung der Stadt Castulo und des Saltus Castulonensis, *Historia* **7**: 95–112, 1958, and, for his remark, 98, note 2; Thouvenot, *op. cit.* (see note 17), 483.

[25] *Hispania antiqua epigraphica*, no. 166: 1–3, 1950–1952; *cf. CIL* 2, 1264. So also in the upper Singilis valley the doubtful ethicon Baxo (*CIL* 2, 2060) has been found to represent a romanized town (Baxonensis, *Hisp. Ant. Epig.*, no. 164, 1–3, Consejo superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Arqueología y Prehistoria "Rodrigo Caro," 1950–1952).

[26] L. Monteagudo, Carta de Coruña romana, I, *Emerita* **19**: 191–225, 1951; II, Costa, *ibid.* **20**: 467–490, 1952.

[27] Now attractively presented by John Bradford, *Ancient landscapes*, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1957. See also, for the Po Valley, P. Fraccaro, *Opuscula* **3**: 51–170, Pavia, Presso la Revista Athenaeum, 1957; and, for Tunisia, *Atlas des centuriations romaines de Tunisie*, Paris, 1954.

[28] Thulin, *Corpus Agrimensor. Roman.* 1: 135–136, Leipzig, Teubner, 1913.

[29] See 1, 3, 43; 1, 3, 214; 2, 146; 2, 274.

Over thirty years ago Rostovtzeff[30] pointed out emphatically that the study of romanization of the provinces depended on the preparation of more studies of the towns of the Empire. In Italy, Gaul, along the Rhine, we are pretty well supplied, and much has been done in Africa. Now more such studies are coming out of Spain, with progress also in the closely allied tasks of studying the remains above ground and of further excavation, as the annual reports in *Fasti Archaeologici* reveal. Excavations are in progress at Tarraco. Those at Iuliobriga and Clunia have interestingly revealed the use of Mediterranean forms of building on the high and inclement lands of Old Castile and Cantabria.[31] But as lately as 1948 a Spanish scholar[32] lamented the inadequate publication of the walls and fortifications of towns, this even though I. A. Richmond in 1931 had been able to draw important historical conclusions from a study of the fortifications of Astorga, Lugo, Leon, Barcelona, and Saragoza.[33]

The same lament reappears at the beginning of the Spanish chapter in Davies'[34] useful book on *Roman Mines in Europe:* "It is a pity that much of the evidence from Spain is badly documented and unpublished, as a thorough survey of the Spanish mines would be of great importance and interest." Yet Spain was for a long time the chief source of metals for the ancient world. Further study might be of benefit to social and economic history as well as the history of technology, for as the state took possession of mines and quarries there was less opportunity for the development in those areas of the urban life on which romanization largely depended. Here, as on the great imperial estates, the tendency was even anti-urban. We need to know more about the mining communities, and about the status of the miners themselves.

Finally, the chief body of evidence for the history of the provinces, now as in Mommsen's day, remains the inscriptions. Yet no continuation of the Spanish volume of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* has been published since 1892. Two supplementary collections were published in the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*[35] during the next eleven years. Since then, although preparations for a new supplement began in 1928[36] we have had to depend on the *Année Épigraphique*, and many inscriptions were missed because they were reported in local journals of short life and little circulation. According to Professor Alvaro D'Ors[37] of Santiago de Compostela more than a thousand inscriptions lie unpublished in Spanish collections and museums; while many of the published ones require review, for the editor of the *Corpus* was frequently unable to check his results and some of the older collectors like the Marquis of Montsalud, and even as good an epigrapher as Fita, were at times a mark for forgers. Recent developments are hopeful. Serra Rafols contributes full reports to the *Fasti Archaeologici*. The inscriptions of Santiago de Compostela and of Lugo have recently been republished in more modern fashion, and a new Spanish review, *Hispania Antiqua Epigraphica*,[38] reports current finds with commentary. The

[30] Rostovtzeff, *Social and economic history of the Roman Empire*,[2] 593, note 4.

[31] The earlier excavations are noticed in the bibliography in *Cambridge ancient history* **11**: 904–905, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1936. On Emporiae, for example, see M. Almagro, *op. cit.* (see note 13); on Iuliobriga, A. Garcia y Bellido, La excavación de la antigua ciudad cántabra de "Iuliobriga," *Archiv. Esp. Arqueol.* **26**: 193–207, 1953; on Clunia, B. Taracena, El palacio romana de Clunia, *ibid.* **19**: 29–69, 1946; on Bilbilis, Miguel Dolç, La sembranza arqueológica de Bilbilis, *ibid.*, 179–211; and on Cartagena, A. Beltran, El plano arqueológico de Cartagena, *ibid.* **25**: 47 ff., 1952; *cf.* **21**: 191 ff., 1948.

[32] B. Taracena Aguirre, Las fortificaciones y la población de la España romana, *Crónica del IV Congreso Arqueológico del sudeste español*, Elche, 1948, 421 ff., Cartagena, Papeleria española, 1949. For a recent study at Tarraco, see J. S. Vilaro, La muralla de Tarragona, *Archiv. Exp. Arqueol.* **22**: 221–236, 1949.

[33] Five Town-walls in Hispania Citerior, *Jour. Rom. Stud.* **21**: 86–100, 1931.

[34] O. Davies, *Roman mines in Europe*, 94–139, esp. 94, note 1, Oxford, Clarendon, 1935.

[35] E. Huebner, *Ephemeris epigraphica* **8**: 351–528, pub. 1899; **9**: 12–185, pub. 1913, fasc. 1 pub. in 1903, Berlin, Reimer.

[36] L. Wickert, Bericht über eine Reise zur Vorbereitung eines Supplementum Hispaniense des Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, *Sitz.-Ber. Berlin Akad.*, 54–60, 1929; Bericht über eine zweite Reise zur Vorbereitung von *CIL* II Suppl. 2, *ibid.*, 829–844, 1931.

[37] Alvaro D'Ors, La revision de *CIL* II et spécialement des inscriptions juridiques de l'Espagne, *Actes du II[e] Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, Paris, 1952, 145–152, Paris, Massonneuve, 1953.

[38] *Inscripciones romanas de Galicia*, I. *Santiago de Compostela*, by F. Bouza Brey and Alvaro D'Ors, Santiago, Instituto Padre Sarmiento de Estudios Gallegos, 1949; II, *Provincia de Lugo*, by F. Vásquez Saco and M. Vásquez Seijas, Santiago, Instituto Padre Sarmiento de Estudios Gallegos, 1954. Alvaro D'Ors, *Epigrafia jurídica de la España romana*, Madrid, Instituto Nacional de Estudios Jurídicos, 1953; *Hispania antiqua epigraphica* **1–3**, 1950–1952, Madrid; **4–5**, 1953–1954, Madrid; **6–7**, 1955–1956, Madrid.

means of bringing this fundamental body of evidence up to date are steadily improving. Thus in spite of many lacks the opportunity for advances in the study of the Spanish provinces in Roman times is in prospect, and they may receive the attention their importance warrants.

In this paper I have tried to do two things: to give a partial illustration of what the study of romanization in Spain involves, and to suggest some ways of advancing that study; but I have stated them mainly in terms of the impact of Rome on the Spanish provinces. What of their importance and their impact on Rome? Because of them the Romans were early compelled to increase the number of their magistrates, while in them the Roman army received a long and expensive, and also undesired, military training, discovered new and better weapons, and in turn began to recruit many of its best troops. They were for a long period the chief source of metals and many other products, and received large numbers of colonists, both civil and military. In the first century of the Empire they sent back to Rome a number of leading senators and other administrators, as well as a distinguished series of leading writers, in rhetoric, philosophy, and poetry, besides an expert on agriculture and an expert on education. And finally they moved into the highest place and sent two imperial dynasties too.

# LIBANIUS' ORATION IN PRAISE OF ANTIOCH (ORATION XI)

**Translated with Introduction and Commentary by**

GLANVILLE DOWNEY

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 652 |
| Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch | 652 |
| Ancient Antioch | 653 |
| Literature on Antioch | 654 |
| Translations of Libanius | 654 |
| Translation | 656 |
| Commentary | 681 |
| Bibliography | 685 |

## INTRODUCTION

### LIBANIUS' ORATION IN PRAISE OF ANTIOCH

As a contemporary account, by a noted man of letters, of one of the principal cities of the Graeco-Roman world, Libanius' *Oration in Praise of Antioch* is of special interest today in many respects. Libanius' love of his native city, and his pride in its eminence and beauty, have left for us an encomium which is not only a precious document for the history and antiquities of Antioch, and for daily life in the city in the middle of the fourth century after Christ, but illuminating testimony to the importance of the role of the cities in the ancient world.[1] The whole of the oration has never before been available in a translation into any modern language, and there has not yet been made any study of the oration in which the results of the excavations conducted at Antioch in 1932–1939 have been utilized. The present translation and commentary will, it is hoped, not only aid scholars and students in the reading of a lengthy and sometimes difficult Greek text, but make more widely known a characteristic example, which quickly became famous in antiquity itself, of the expression of one of the fundamental factors in classical civilization, local patriotism and the praise of famous cities. A well-known example is the *Panathenaicus* of Isocrates. Aelius Aristides of Smyrna composed panegyrics of Rome, Athens, and Smyrna, of which the first named has recently been made available in a new edition of the Greek text, accompanied by a commentary and an important study, by J. H. Oliver; and A. D. Nock has published a study of Libanius' oration which marks a significant advance in our knowledge of the literary antecedents and cultural background of the work.[2] Further study will bring new insights into this civilization and will in particular enable us to understand better the way in which the classical heritage had been transmitted at Antioch down to the fourth century after Christ, the period in which began the merging of classical civilization with Christianity out of which our own culture has grown.

Libanius was born in Antioch in A.D. 314 and became one of its most illustrious citizens, as well as one of the best known teachers and writers of his day.[3] He studied in Athens, then, in the winter of A.D. 340–341, opened a school in Constantinople which was immediately successful. In 346 he moved his school to Nicomedia; then after a brief period in Constantinople once more, he settled finally in Antioch (354). His school there became celebrated, and some of his pupils became the most eminent men of the time. Libanius lived until nearly the end of the fourth century, and throughout his life was one of the champions of the pagan culture which was being replaced by the new Christian education.

The *Oration in Praise of Antioch* (*Orat.* XI, called the *Antiochikos* in Greek) was written in

[1] On the cities as focal points of all aspects of life, see the two volumes by A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the eastern Roman provinces*, Oxford University Press, 1937, and *The Greek city from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford University Press, 1940. The present writer's *History of Antioch* will be published by the Princeton University Press.

[2] J. H. Oliver, The ruling power: a study of the Roman Empire in the second century after Christ through the Roman oration of Aelius Aristides, *Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc.* **43** (4), 1953; A. D. Nock, The praises of Antioch, *Jour. Egyptian Archaeology* **40**: 76–82, 1954.

[3] On Libanius' life and works, see J. W. H. Walden, *The universities of Ancient Greece*, New York, Scribner, 1909, and two recent studies by Paul Petit, *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IV^e siècle après J.-C.*, Paris, Paul Geuthner, 1944, and *Les étudiants de Libanius*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1957.

A.D. 360, when Libanius, at forty-six, was at the height of his career; it was recited at least in part at the celebration in the summer of that year of the local Olympic games of Antioch, a festival, in imitation of the ancient Olympic games, which drew many visitors.[4] The oration was widely read, and is preserved in a large number of manuscripts.[5]

The *editio princeps* of the oration was published by F. Morel, *Libanii Sophistae opera*, II (Paris, 1627), pp. 332–388 (Greek text with Latin translation). Morel's text, being based on only a few of the many manuscripts, is no longer adequate. The standard edition of the Greek text, accompanied by references to sources and to parallel passages, is that of R. Förster in the first volume (Leipzig, 1903) of his Teubner edition of the works of Libanius. The only previous commentary on the whole of the oration is that of J. J. Reiske, first published in his quarto edition of the orations and declamations of Libanius, *Libanii Sophistae orationes et declamationes* (Altenburg, 1784), pp. 121–161 (volume I alone appeared in this format), and repeated in the posthumous octavo edition which bears the same title (Altenburg, 1791), I, pp. 275–365. The commentary in these editions contains most, but not all, of the smaller collection of notes which Reiske had previously published in his *Animadversiones*, V (Leipzig, 1766), pp. 205–225.

The first part of the oration (§§ 1–131) has been translated and annotated by L. Hugi under the misleading title *Der Antiochikos des Libanios, eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Diss., Freiburg-in-der-Schweiz; Solothurn, 1919). Hugi writes (p. 4) that his original dissertation, presented in 1913, contained the whole of the oration but that he was prevented by the increased cost of printing from publishing more than the first portion. The hope which he expressed of being able to print the remainder, when conditions became more favorable, seems unfortunately never to have been realized.

The present translation is based upon Förster's Teubner text, with only a few minor alterations which it seemed necessary to make.[6] The brief commentary is intended to provide the information necessary for the understanding of the oration, but it has seemed unnecessary to repeat the detailed discussions of certain philological and historical points which are already available in the notes of Reiske and Hugi, since the reader who intends to make a detailed study of the work will wish to have their editions, as well as Förster's Greek text, at hand. The present translator takes this occasion to express his indebtedness to his predecessors.

### ANCIENT ANTIOCH

Libanius' oration gives us a better general picture of the topography and the appearance of Antioch than any other single source,[7] and his discourse served as one of the bases for the remarkable reconstruction of the topography of the city, based solely on the literary sources, by Carl Otfried Müller, in his pioneer monograph, *Antiquitates Antiochenae* (Göttingen, 1839). In many details the oration furnishes valuable information which does not appear in any other ancient source, e.g., the plan of Diocletian's palace at Antioch, the lay-out of the main streets on the island, the construction of the Nymphaeum, the style of the private houses, the appearance of the road from Antioch to its famous suburb Daphne, and some of the legends of the founding and the early history of the city. With the knowledge furnished by Libanius and other literary sources, and the discoveries made in the excavations, we now possess a many-sided and illuminating picture of Antioch. In 1932 excavations were begun by the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity, and annual campaigns continued until they were interrupted in the summer of 1939 by the approach of war.[8] A general account of the history of the

[4] On the date of the oration, see the introduction to Förster's edition, I, 1: 412, also Petit, *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche*, 126. On the games, see G. Downey, The Olympic Games of Antioch in the fourth century A.D., *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* **70**: 428–438, 1939; Petit, *op cit.*, 123–144; W. Liebeschuetz, The Syriarch in the fourth century, *Historia* **8**: 113–126, 1959.

[5] See Förster, *loc. cit.* A number of passages from Libanius' oration were borrowed, often verbatim, by Nikolaos Mesarites in his description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, written at some time between A.D. 1198 and 1203. See the list of the borrowings in the edition of Mesarites' description by G. Downey, Nikolaos Mesarites, Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, *Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc.* **47** (6): 862, note on chapter III, 1957.

[6] *Cf.* §§ 206, 233, 238, 248, also the correction of the numbering of §§ 236–236A.

[7] Malalas' *Chronicle* provides more factual information, but this is scattered through the work, and the chronicler does not pretend to describe the city as a whole.

[8] Four volumes of excavation reports have been published by the Princeton University Press, 1934–1952: *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, **1**: *The excavations of 1932*; *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, **2**: *The excavations, 1933-1936*; *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, **3**: *The excavations, 1937-1939*; *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, **4**, pt. 1: *Ceramics and Islamic coins*; *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, **4**, pt. 2: *Greek, Roman, Byzantine and Crusaders'*

city, and of the principal mosaic floors found in the excavations, was published by the Chairman of the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity, C. R. Morey, *The Mosaics of Antioch* (New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1938). This contains (p. 17) a restored plan of the city which is reprinted here (fig. 1). It is interesting to compare this plan with that of Müller (*op. cit.*, plate A), who had never been able to visit the site, and had to rely entirely on literary texts.

A kind of companion piece to Libanius' oration is the famous Yakto mosaic, found in 1932 in Yakto, a hamlet of Daphne, the suburb of Antioch. This floor, which formed a part of a large house, was surrounded by a topographical border which shows typical scenes of Antioch and Daphne—buildings, statues, travelers, artisans, street scenes.[9] Dated in the middle of the fifth century, this border gives us glimpses of the city and of Daphne very much as they were in the days of Libanius. In many respects the people who appear in the Yakto mosaic have hardly changed, in essentials, since that time; and many of the scenes in the mosaic are duplicated in the streets of Antioch today.[10] A comparison of the tour of the city indicated in the border of the mosaic with Libanius' account of the topography will appear in my *History of Antioch* which is in press.

## LITERATURE ON ANTIOCH

The first modern history of Antioch, and in some ways still the best, is that of C. O. Müller (1839) mentioned above. This was supplemented by an article written by R. Förster after a visit to the site, "Antiochia am Orontes," *Jahrbuch des kaiserlichen deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* **12**: 103–149, 1897, and the basic material has also been brought together in H. Leclercq's article "Antioche (archéologie,)" in Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* **1**: cols. 2359–2427, 1907. An elaborate popular guide by Lt.-Col. P. Jacquot, of the French army, *Antioche, centre de tourisme*, 3 v., Antioch, Comité de tourisme, 1931, contains useful material, including photographs, maps and drawings, not available elsewhere. This work also includes an account of the country around Antioch. A study of the social life of the city has been made by G. Haddad, *Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*, Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949. The physical development of the city in ancient and modern times is studied by J. Weulersse, "Antioche, essai de géographie urbaine," *Bulletin d'études orientales* (*Institut Français de Damas*) **4**: 27–79, 1934. Other modern studies are cited below in the commentary.

## TRANSLATIONS OF LIBANIUS

The voluminous writings of Libanius form one of the principal sources for our knowledge of Antioch, especially during the fourth century after Christ; but his Greek is not always easy to read, and there exists no detailed commentary on his work, so that Libanius' testimony has not always been fully exploited. The edition of the Greek text by J. J. Reiske, *Libanii Sophistae Orationes et Declamationes* (Altenburg, 1791) is very useful so far as it goes, but it does not undertake to provide a complete exegesis. The introductions, brief notes, and index in R. Förster's Teubner edition (*Libanii Opera*, 12 vols., Leipzig, 1903–1923) are of great value, but here again the scope of the edition precluded a detailed commentary, particularly on the linguistic and stylistic difficulties of the text. As a consequence, translations of Libanius' works are of special importance as aids in the utilization of his work. For a long time, the only translations available were the Latin versions of F. Morel of some of the orations, printed in his edition of some of the orations (*Libanii Orationes* **2**, Paris, 1627), but these renderings are not always accurate or easy to read. Beginning in the last century, several scholars have made translations of individual orations, which are listed below, and more are needed.

For the convenience of scholars, a list of the existing translations of Libanius' works is printed below. A special word needs to be said about the translation of E. Monnier, which remained unpublished, but exists in two sets of page proofs, one of which is in the Library of the Sorbonne in Paris (Réserve, R. 322), while the other is in the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library in Washington, D.C. (as to whether other copies of the proofs may exist, the present writer has no knowledge). E. Monnier, who was a professor at the

*Coins*. These volumes are abbreviated here as *Antioch* **1**, **2**, **3**, **4**.

[9] The floor was first published by J. Lassus in *Antioch* **1**: 114–156; see also D. Levi, *Antioch Mosaic pavements*, 326–337, 614 ff. (with plates 79–80), Princeton University Press, 1947.

[10] This is demonstrated in the ingenious article by Jean Lassus, Dans les rues d'Antioche, *Bull. d'études orientales* **5**: 121–124, 1935, with seven plates in which snapshots taken in the streets of modern Antioch are placed side by side with details of the mosaic floor showing corresponding scenes and persons.

Lycée in Poitiers, was led by his researches on Libanius (which were partly published in his *Historie de Libanius, Première partie, Examen de ses Mémoires depuis l'époque de sa naissance jusqu'à l'année 355 ap. J.-C.*, Paris, 1866) to prepare critical editions of the Greek text of ten of the orations, accompanied by French translations. The work was set in type but was never published, possibly because Monnier regarded it as incomplete.

The copy in the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, which comprises 389 pages, has no title page, but contains a leaf, written in contemporary handwriting, describing the history of the book as follows:

Libanius

Discours choisis

Εκλέκτοι [sic] λόγοι

texte grec et traduction française

Bonnes feuilles d'un ouvrage de M. Monnier, professeur au Lycée de Poitiers, auteur d'une thèse sur Libanius.

ouvrage inachevé.

Note d'Emile Egger, écrite sur la premier feuillet d'un exemplaire de ce même ouvrage, conservé à la Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, dans la Réserve, où il porte la cote R. 322, 8°:

"Inachevé jusqu'à ce jour (mai 1861)

"Bonnes feuilles

"Ouvrage de M. Monnier, professeur au Lycée de Poitiers

"Emile Egger."

l'exemplarie de la Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne porte l'indication: 384 p.—cet examplaire ci en a 389.

The copy in the Sorbonne library was used by Förster in the preparation of his Teubner edition (see his note in his edition, v. 1, p. 15, n. 1).

A concordance of the numbers assigned to the orations by Monnier in his edition with the numbers later adopted by Förster in his edition is as follows:

| Monnier | Förster |
|---|---|
| 1 | 31 |
| 2 | 61 |
| 3 | 16 |
| 4 | 62 |
| 5 | 24 |
| 6 | 2 |
| 7 | 37 |
| 8 | 50 |
| 9 | 33 |
| 10 | 30 |

I have not seen the Russian translation of sixteen orations by S. P. Schestakov, published in 2 volumes at Kazan, 1912. See the review by V. Beneševič, *Byzantinische-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* **8**: 393, 1929–1930.

Monnier, *Discours choisis* = the unpublished translations of E. Monnier, described above.

*Oration*

1. *Autobiography.* Tr. in L. Petit, *Essai sur la vie et la correspondance du sophiste Libanius*, Paris, 1866. This is not always accurate.
2. *Against his Detractors.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
5. *Artemis.* Tr. to be published in G. Downey, *History of Antioch* (in press).
9. *On the Kalends.* A free translation of part of the oration is given by G. Bilfinger, *Das germanische Iulfest*, 41 ff., Stuttgart, 1901. I have not seen this; *cf.* Förster's introduction in his Teubner edition, **1**: 392.
10. *On the Plethron.* Tr. to be published in G. Downey, *History of Antioch* (in press).
11. *Antiochikos.* Tr. by G. Downey, below, Tr. of §§ 1–131 by L. Hugi, *Der Antiochikos des Libanius*, Diss., Freiburg-i.-d.-Schweiz, 1919.
16. *To the People of Antioch, on the Anger of the Emperor Julian.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
18. *Epitaphios on Julian.* Tr. in C. W. King, *Julian the Emperor, Containing Gregory Nazianzen's Two Invectives and Libanius' Monody*, London, 1888.
19. *To the Emperor Theodosius, on the Disorders at Antioch.* Tr. in I. L. Genin, *Discours de Flavien et de Libanius à l'Empereur Théodose, en faveur de la ville d'Antioche*, Paris, 1826. I have not seen Genin's work; Förster in his Teubner edition (**2**: 384) describes it as unsatisfactory.
24. *On the Punishment for the Death of the Emperor Julian.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
30. *On Behalf of the Pagan Temples.* Tr. in R. van Loy, "Le *Pro Templis* de Libanius," *Byzantion* **8**: 1–39, 384–404, 1933, also in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
31. *To the People of Antioch, On Behalf of the Rhetors.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
33. *To the Emperor Theodosius, Against Tisamenus.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
37. *To Polycles.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*

45. *On the Prisoners.* Tr. in R. A. Pack, *Studies in Libanius and Antiochene Society under Theodosius*, Diss., Michigan, 1935.
47. *On Patronage.* Tr. in L. Harmand, *Libanius, Discours sur les patronages*, Paris, 1955.
50. *On Behalf of the Farmers, Concerning Forced Public Service.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
61. *Monody on Nicomedia.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*
62. *Against those who Criticized his Teaching.* Tr. in Monnier, *Discours choisis.*

For the *Epistles*, there is the Latin translation of J. C. Wolf, *Libanii Sophistae Epistolae, quas . . . edidit, latine convertit et notis illustravit J. C. Wolfius*, Amsterdam, 1738.

## TRANSLATION

### LIBANIUS

### IN PRAISE OF ANTIOCH

1. One might rightly blame both—myself, the professional man of letters, and you, who hear me; yourselves, since, though you have with the greatest pleasure seen my talent exercised on other subjects and have even called for some of them, you have never laid upon me this particular task, namely to honor the city with a discourse; and myself, because, though I have written more works than any of my contemporaries, and in praising some men and counseling others, I have engaged in not a few contests in my literary productions, I have remained silent in the face of any praise of the city that bore me. 2. More properly, there is no cause to blame you for not seeking out the author of an encomium, for while it is sweet to listen to praise, it is indeed stupid to woo it. As for me, the accusation clearly finds me out, for when it was necessary to pay at once the most honorable debts of all, I delayed in the matter, and while I have in no wise ceased from speaking in the city on other subjects, I have postponed the discourse addressed to the city itself, like one who is diligent, before his mother's eyes, in caring for other people, but is neglectful of her herself. 3. And indeed it is not praiseworthy for a man to confess that he possesses his skill from you, while at the same time, though he has received it thus, he will not employ it on behalf of those who have given it to him, but instead, in the gatherings in the market-place is content to show how far his writings excel others, while he will not take the trouble to make those exhibitions into a book.

4. While it has been possible, in the light of such speechlessness on my part, for anyone who wishes to, to blame my silence, nevertheless there is a certain excuse for my quietude. My failure to speak was not to be interpreted as a final resolve not to speak; to speak was my dominant thought, but in the postponement there was a kind of hope that my eloquence would be greater as time added to my skill. 5. My silence until the present moment has been that of a man who was fearful, rather than neglectful, and who wished to make his praises fairer, rather than to evade completely the rendering of praise. The purpose of my eloquence has been nothing more than to satisfy the audience, while I hope that pardon for not speaking previously may be obtained because of my purpose.

6. It is a common custom of writers of encomia to affirm that the weakness of their talent falls short of the magnitude of the subjects toward which they direct their discourse, and to ask pardon of their listeners if, wishing to approximate the truth, they involuntarily fail to do so. I, however, believe that such pardon is due to me for every reason, while it is not due for any reason whatever to the others who have undertaken this same subject. 7. For those indeed who have come here from other places there was no compulsion to write such a discourse; for, if they spoke according to the rules of the art, they would make themselves agreeable; while, if they did not do this, they would not have seemed to fail to make a necessary tribute. When a man is free either to speak or not to speak, he is worthy of praise when he achieves his purpose, but needs no pardon if he fails. 8. So when a man who could avoid making his beginning in such a way as to be in need of asking indulgence, falls into this need of his own free will, it is right that he be deprived of such indulgence. In my own case, since I have been drawn to this composition by the just merits of my native city, and, since either one of two things was necessary for me, either to speak in some fashion or other out of my present resources, or to seem to be a poor citizen, how can I not win pardon from all sides? 9. And if I had had sufficient means for a *choregia*, perhaps it would have been suitable for me to fulfill my duty in that fashion, and not to run the risk involved in writing a discourse. But since I

have been prevented by Fortune from performing public liturgies in that fashion, and since it is still necessary for me to come forward and myself bring some gift to the city, my daring in preparing this discourse, in fear of the consequences of silence, will win pardon for me.

10. Most of those who come to hear me, seeing the present good fortune of the city, but knowing nothing of its splendor in ancient times, will, while they admire the former, suppose that the latter did not exist; so they will think that I shall at once take up the city's present greatness, and its superiority in its present state, as though I were to admit myself that while the city in its recent history surpasses all others, in its ancient history it was itself surpassed. 11. It is necessary, however, for me first to do honor to the memory of those ancient times, and then to speak of them in such fashion that there will be shown to be harmony between the present circumstances of the city and those of former times, and so that it will appear that its present circumstances are owed to the same factors through which in antiquity it was preeminent, and that its brilliance today does not depend upon less important causes.

12. Before, however, I set forth who were the people who first occupied this land, I must speak of the nature of the land and what manner of breezes it possesses, how it is situated with respect to the sea, what it possesses in the way of water, what sort of land it is for the raising of crops, and in general concerning the advantages which exist here. For since the land is in fact older than its inhabitants, it is fitting for the praise of the land to come before that which will be given to the race.

13. Indeed the first and greatest praise of a city is the excellence of its land, just as is the case, I believe, with a ship when the keel is strong to which all the other members are fastened. This subject, then, must be tested before the others. 14. I shall not be persuaded to comply with the usage of most orators, who strain themselves to show that whatever particular place they are praising is the center of the earth. First of all, if this distinction is the property of one city, and if in addition it be a fair city of which it is the property, all this can belong to one city alone, because it is not possible for others as well to be in the middle. Thus most such orations are foolish. 15. Then again, if being situated in the center of the earth brought with it superiority in all respects, the eagerness of those who compete in this matter could have a certain justification. But if Egypt and rocky Delphi are not the same in respect to productiveness of crops, why should a man point to the central location of the city which he is praising instead of proving its real fairness?

16. This, now, I can say concerning my native city, that it is the fairest adornment of the land that is fairest under heaven. It is generally agreed, indeed, that the best part of the earth is that which the god of the sun, on rising, first strikes with his rays. 17. For kings, this part of the earth is a much-fought-for possession; and the ruler to whom it belongs is a greater man because he possesses it, while to all other men who hear its name, that name comes bringing a kind of loveliness with it and it fills their souls with pleasure, like those dreams which rejoice sleepers with their visions of gardens. 18. Thus it is that, the whole East possessing the finest things, these superiorities come to us. To other people, their own land gives one thing but does not give another; or rather, by Zeus, it brings all kinds of gifts, but because of the excesses of the climate it does not escape disagreeable features, or if it avoids these it suffers from lack of water and thus spoils its good fortune in other respects. 19. With us, however, all things vie with one another, the land, the streams, the temperate blending of the climate. As for the land, it is level like the sea, deep and rich and soft, yielding easily to the plow, wonderfully surpassing the expectations of its farmers, at once good for sowing and good for growing, and splendidly suited to both kinds of crops, providing tall trees in all their beauty and sheaves of grain taller than trees are in other lands, and crops in abundance, with more than an abundance of beauty. 20. Nothing is absent whose presence is to be desired; but if you speak of Dionysus, his festival is often celebrated here, or if you mention Athene, the earth is blooming with her trees. Therefore, much wine goes hence to our neighbors, and even more oil is carried in freight-ships all over the world. 21. And Demeter loved our land so much more than Sicily, that when Hephaestus on his shield made a golden field, she made our part of the earth, in its color, not a little like gold; and likewise her crops are such as they are nowhere else, and are truly the gift of the yellow-haired goddess.

22. As for our mountains, some of them lie within our land, some round about it; some cut across the flat country, while other broad ones

guard the entrance, and others still surround it along its boundaries. Some of these, in their formation, differ from the sloping ground, being raised up to a height; others vie in the excellence of their soil with the land below them, and the farmers do not hold them in scorn, for they drive their yokes over the summits; and all that the level land alone bears elsewhere, our mountains grow, while the things that the mountains alone can give elsewhere, among us are produced by the plains as well. 23. One section is not distinguished for the growing of fruit trees and another for the sowing of seed; but in the same fields you can see trees rising up and wheat flourishing beneath the trees, or rather the land both produces these things separately and brings them together. This piece of land is rich in wheat, and that rich in wine, while another unites all things in itself.

24. Moreover, the circumstance that the mountains do not fall short of the plains in productivity does not easily permit the country to suffer famine; for when the weather at any season is abnormal, the same damage does not occur to the two types of land. What is insufficient for the lower lands is often adequate for those which are higher, and what causes damage there, the lands below often escape, so that it is possible for most crops to grow in safety, since either the whole country is flourishing, or at least one of the two types of land.

25. Such parts of the mountains as are not fertile by nature make their contributions in other ways. Some, through their quarries, furnish walls for the buildings of the city, while others through their forests furnish the roofs and assist in other ways, and in addition to this they provide fire for the bakers and the baths, by means of which we not only live, but have the means to live in comfort. 26. The flocks and the herds of cattle contribute their nourishment to mankind, and no part of the land lies idle, like a part of a crippled body, but some parts of it repay labor with great generosity, while other parts bring their gifts without labor.

27. And then the rivers which run through the country, who could number them, some large, some small, some flourishing at all seasons, others created by the winter, all equally useful, some flowing from the mountains, some rising in the plains, some flowing into one another, others into the lake and others still journeying to the sea?

28. Then the springs and their unfailing riches are truly a unique characteristic of ours, and no man is so bold, or so proud of the gifts of the nymphs, that he would boast that he had possessions equal to ours in this respect.

29. Over so fair a land as ours the Seasons dance harmoniously and do not spoil its charm by any unseemly conduct on their part. For neither does winter out of jealousy encroach upon the time of spring, claiming that season's charm for itself, nor does summer, in the same fashion, stretch out into winter, turning out the season which comes between the two; but each remains within its bounds and divides up an equal measure of the year, and gives place when the next season approaches. And the greatest thing is that those which are in their extreme forms grievous to the body, the one by reason of excess of cold, the other through excess of heat, seem among us to be chastened and to wish to resemble the milder seasons. 30. It seems to me as though they had made an agreement with each other to share each other's characteristics, so that winter shows a certain element in common with summer, in its mildness and harmlessness, while summer on the other hand has received from winter enough of its character to serve as a defence against distressing heat. 31. And while winter provides rain to satiety for the earth, taking away the cold, the heat makes the wheat spring up and fosters it with the summer breezes which save both our bodies and crops from damage from burning heat. Thus for us alone is it possible to enjoy whichever of the seasons is present and to receive the coming one with pleasure, since in all of them there is a certain temperateness and gracefulness. 32. Among the peoples of other countries, most find fault with the whole cycle of the seasons, while others, experiencing some seasons which are better and then others which are not so good, suffer the same experience as those who change suddenly from peace to war; for when one of the better seasons has fulfilled its time and departs, the harsher one descends upon them, and, before they have had time for any real enjoyment, they have to lament the departing season, which they are unable to hold back, and at the same time live in dread of the one which is coming upon them. One of the seasons forces them to be bathed in sweat and to spend their time struggling about the springs, while the other compels them to spend their time in bed like sick folk, shut in by the snow. 33. To us alone is the present part of the year pleasant and the ex-

pected season no less pleasant; for one season, having given us pleasure, passes by, and the next approaches bringing equal pleasure, and we differ in no way from the folk who travel along those roads which are divided up from beginning to end by shady springs and places of rest, and send travelers on their way rejoicing.

34. Just as is the case of our good fortune in the seasons, our situation with regard to the sea is such that, if our position in this respect were not as it is, I should count it a shortcoming. For neither are we separated from the sea by a journey of days, nor is our city founded directly on the shore.

35. How much of a harm each of these is to a city, I shall briefly make clear. Or rather how harmful it is to be wholly separated from the sea, is plain to all, and a man who called a city thus situated one-eyed would not be mistaken; but the advantage of not being placed directly upon the sea requires demonstration. 36. First, the cities which are placed down by the sea have to fear the floods which it causes, and their confidence is ruined by the example of the cities which have been overwhelmed. 37. Again, those to whom it gives pleasure to be able to gaze over the backs of the sea and to watch the freight-ships sailing and to listen to the shouted commands, are given more anguish than pleasure when, before the eyes of those who were just now enjoying such pleasure, the wave driven on by the billows overwhelms the vessels and changes the sailors' calls to cries for help, and fills the city with news of the shipwreck. 38. But the greatest cause of harm is that a city placed on the sea is forced to suffer from the vulgarity of sailors and their disorderly brawls and their ribald talk and from all the other things which have the power to ruin and destroy the morals of a city; for such a city will both receive those who come sailing to it from abroad, and send its own people out as sailors. And then the evil ways of only a part spreads through the whole population.

39. Our own situation, however, permitting us to enjoy the good things which come from the sea, also permits us to remain free from its evils; and we are both free from harm, along with those who live inland, and enjoy the benefits of the sea along with those who live close to it. 40. So we differ from the former in our abundance of the necessaries of life, and from the latter in the moderation in our way of living; and while we possess the things which are counted blessings by both, we escape the things by which both are afflicted. Thus, the others claim advantages over each other in some respects, and are outdone in other ways; but we are superior to each of them and inferior to neither. 41. The distance that separates us from the sea, indeed, is just so much as keeps us untainted from the evils connected with the sea and at the same time permits us to share the good things which come from it. For there are one hundred and twenty stadia between us, so that a well-girt man, setting out hence with the sun, can bring us something from there when the noonday still remains with us.

42. Concerning the nature of the land, then, and the temperate blending of the climate and the situation with respect to the sea, enough perhaps has been said. It would be well to go on concerning the noble lineage of those who possess the region, and of the first settlers and those who followed them and those again who came later, and to demonstrate to all, how the best of lands has come to be the possession of the best of men, like a well-made ship in the hands of good sailors. 43. And though I may seem to speak at greater length than the occasion warrants, my discourse will include only a small part of the things concerning which it would be possible to speak. The reason for this is the multitude of the subjects which pertain to ancient times; and because of this, even though many things be passed over in silence, what is said will not fail to seem lengthy. The historical treatises will preserve exact accounts; we need speak only of so much as is fitting for the present occasion.

44. Inachus was the son of Ge and the father of Io. Zeus became smitten with love for this Io, and lay with her. Since this did not escape Hera, he changed the human maiden into a cow and lay with her in this fashion. But Hera—for she knew of this too—smote the cow with a gadfly, and she wandered through both continents. 45. Inachus, seeking his daughter and unable to find her, and desiring mightily to recover her, put ships to sea, and sent aboard them the Argives who are well known in the tale, making Triptolemus the leader of the whole undertaking, and sent them forth in search of his vanished daughter. 46. And they sailed every route, penetrated every strait, passed every headland, went ashore on islands, searched the shores, went up far into the midst of the mainland, being resolved to die before they gave up the search. 47. As they came here to this country, and came

out of their ships, it was night; and they went up to the mountain among the inhabitants, who were few in number, and approached their dwellings and knocked on the doors and made inquiry concerning Io. They found a hospitable welcome; and coming to love the country, they made this the end of their voyage, exchanging their eagerness in the search for a desire to remain. And so, giving up the purpose by which they had been urged on, they put the land which they admired above the goal for which they had set sail. 48. This undertaking had been that they should not fail to find Io, but that they should put aside all thought of their native land; for it had been laid upon them, by him who sent them forth, either to bring the maiden back, or not to return themselves. Thus, when they ceased their search, they were willing to be cut off from their native land. 49. If indeed they had traveled to the ends of the world, and had then decided to stay when nothing remained to be searched, the cause of their guilt would have been necessity, and not simply love of the country; since, however, they made this decision when much of the world remained in which there was some hope of making the discovery, those who put their desire to remain before their hopes really preferred this strange country to their native land. It was to such a degree as this that the land enchanted them. 50. And when they had occupied the land, they were possessed by it completely, and the spell of their fatherland gave way completely before their admiration of the land which had bound them to it. I could wish that Homer, who lived after these events, had not said that nothing is sweeter to men than their fatherland, but had, because of the decision of the Argives, said the opposite, namely that often a better land, drawing men's desires to itself, drives out the remembrance of their native land. 51. And so Triptolemus, who had set out in search of the Argive maiden, settled the people whom he had brought with him and built a city under the mountain and in the city a temple of Zeus, whom he called Nemean; but he gave the name Ione to the city, from the daughter of Inachus. For since it was on giving up the search for her that they settled in the city, they did honor to her by choosing this name for the town. And when they worked the land and reaped its fruits, they changed the epithet of Zeus from Nemean to Fruit-bringing. 52. So Triptolemus, when he had laid the first foundations of the city, was removed from among men and because of the honors due him was numbered among the heroes.

Then the god according to whose desire the city was created, wishing it to be increased by the finest races, moved Kasos to leave Crete, a goodly man, and brought him here, and the noblest of the Cretans followed him. 53. When they came, they found the Argives better than the people they had left at home. For Minos in jealousy had driven them out; but the Argives received them gladly, and gave them a share of the city and of the land and of whatever they possessed. Kasos indeed did not wish to receive in good treatment more than he gave in good works. And seeing that many of the laws of Triptolemus had been altered, he revived them, and he founded Kasiotis. 54. And as he acquired greater knowledge of affairs, he sought to win the good will of the people of Cyprus for the city, and married the daughter of Salaminus, who ruled over the people of Cyprus. As the maiden set sail, there came with her a fleet which formed an escort over the sea for the bride. And when they tasted the pleasures of our land, they gave up their island and became a part of the city. 55. One could find proof of Kasos being celebrated because of his virtues in the fact that the ruler of so great an island was glad to be connected with him by marriage, and proof also of the kindness of Kasos in the circumstance that those who brought the maiden preferred his protection to their dearest kin.

56. It is said also that some of the Herakleidae, after the exile to which they were driven by Eurystheus, taking with them many Eleans, after they had seen and disapproved of the whole of Europe and the remainder of Asia, put an end here to their toils and settled themselves and built Herakleia as an addition to the city.

57. Let one consider our noble descent, and the way in which whatever was finest in all places has flowed together here, as though to a place chosen by the gods to receive men worthy of admiration. We alone have origins which have brought together in the same place the noble elements provided by each of our sources: the high antiquity of the Argives, the just laws of the Cretans, a royal race from Cyprus, and the line of Herakles. 58. As for those whom we received from Athens, and all the other Greek breeds with which we have been blended, the tale will be told later, when our discourse in its progress has come to those times.

59. Now we must tell how the place was from

of old regarded with veneration by the Persian kingdom. And by Zeus it was not only honored by the Persian gods, but by the Assyrians before them. Once Cambyses was conducting a campaign against Egypt, and his queen Meroe was with him. They being encamped in the place to which the queen gave her name, she went to the temple of Artemis to sacrifice; for Semiramis the ruler of the Assyrians had built the temple for the goddess. 60. And seeing that the roof was worn out through old age, she begged Cambyses to mend the damage. So he raised the temple to a greater height by making additions to the walls, and built round it a sacred precinct suitable for the accommodation of the festival; and to this festival he gave the name of his queen. She for her part presented lands to the goddess and established priestesses to care for the shrine and filled it with the riches of Persia, dedicating thrones and couches and bows, all of gold. 61. When these things had been accomplished, those who dwelt in Ione decided to go down to Cambyses. So when they were announced by those whose duty it was to do so, he called them to him and asked them who they were and how they had come to live in his land. 62. When he learned whence they had come, and the fortunes which had brought them there, he marveled that they wished to enter into relations with him rather than lie hidden as he passed by, and he conducted himself not as one who had the right to demand thanks from those who dwelt on his land, but as one who himself was indebted to them for living there. The proof of this is that he gave them gifts as though they were benefactors and sent them away. 63. Let anyone who wishes now allege the fierceness of Cambyses, and say that he was not master of himself. It appears rather from this that our forebears lived both with gods and under their protection. That a man who vented his wrath on everyone, and made cruelty a pleasure, should have overcome his nature at the sight of those men and should not have been provoked to anger against Hellenes who dwelt in the land of the Great King—how can this have failed to be the work of some god who sent these men straight to his tent and arranged both things, namely that they should have courage, and that he should not be harsh, and likewise exorcised their fear, and allayed his anger? 64. And why need one speak in terms of inferences and disregard a well-known fact? The country has been from of old beloved of the gods. For the god whom the Persians hold to be the greatest, Helios, under whose auspices they conduct their campaigns—he is called Mithras in the Persian tongue—this god, when sleep had come upon Cambyses, stood above his head in a dream, during his first sleep, and spoke to him, commanding him to stop there and not to proceed to Egypt, and also foretold that the spot would receive a city, a creation of the Macedonians. 65. Cambyses gave thanks to the god and nearby established a shrine of the brother of Artemis. And thus the place received the deity of the Persians as a dweller in it and a lover of it and a prophet of its coming fortune; and Cambyses, at the prophecy, suffered none of the passion which envy is wont to stir up.

66. The men who glorify Athens and Corinth set up battles of the gods over the cities—over Corinth, of Helios against the ruler of the sea, and over Attica, of Athena against this same god; and they almost undo the harmony of the whole by their recklessness in writing of these battles of gods, trying to adorn the cities which they praise by means of impious ornaments, and seeking to gratify human beings by means of this impiety against the gods, not knowing that by this one lie they destroy confidence in their other praises. 67. With us the gods have become lovers of our land, but there was no war among them over it, for this would not have been lawful. In this way, that which was fair among the Hellenes exists here also, but that which, among them, was better not spoken of, no one here has dared to do. 68. And so the men of that time occupied Ione, the sons regularly taking it over from their fathers; and dealing justly with one another, and getting their living from the ground and paying the accustomed honors to the gods, they lived in all happiness in the midst of the barbarians, producing a city which was a true Hellas and keeping their way of life pure in the midst of so much corruption all around them, like that myth about the Alpheios which has survived to our time, which has it that the river flowed from the Peloponnese to Sicily through the midst of the sea, but yet was unmixed with the sea.

69. The city indeed did not at once become large and populous—it was better, I think, this way—but its growth awaited a more favorable time; it existed in a restricted shape, remaining small, for as long as it was not better for it to be larger. 70. What does this mean? If its size had extended over the greatest possible amount of land when Asia was still held by the Persians, who were strong in their wealth and stout in arms

and brilliant in all things, it would have been necessary for the people of the city, when called by their rulers to take part in their campaigns, either to obey and go to war, or not to obey and fight the Persians, one city against so great an empire. The former course would not have been seemly nor the latter free from danger. 71. But then, since the inhabitants had not increased contrary to what was fitting to the times, but had stood still at that point in their size which excused them from doing anything unpleasant and from suffering any evil, they advanced to their greatness, when it was time to rule, like nobly-born boys who escape notice on account of their youth under a tyranny, but reach young manhood when the tyranny has already ceased. 72. For after the battle at Issus and the flight of Darius, Alexander, who possessed part of Asia, but desired the rest of it, since he thought little of what he had already won, but instead looked toward the ends of the earth, came to this region, and pitched his tent near the spring which now, through his work, has the form of a shrine, though its only adornment then was its water; and refreshing his body there after his toils he drank the cold clear sweet water of the spring. 73. The sweetness of the drink reminded Alexander of his mother's breast; and he said to his companions that everything that was in his mother's breast was in the water too; and he gave his mother's name to the spring. When Darius was campaigning against the Scythians, the river Tearos in Thrace seemed to him the fairest of rivers, and setting up a tablet, Darius inscribed upon it that the Tearos was the fairest among rivers; Alexander however did not put our spring into a contest with other waters, but declared it equal to the milk of Olympias. So great was the pleasure which he found in these streams. 74. Wherefore he at once adorned the spot with a fountain and with such of the other appropriate details as were possible on such a campaign, which he was conducting in the swiftest possible manner; and he began to build a city, since he had found a spot which was capable of giving scope to his own magnificence. 75. Possessed of a two-fold desire, both for our land, and for the possession of the remaining lands, and constrained by the one to remain, and driven by the other to hasten on, and with his soul torn between the desire to settle and the desire to carry on the war, he did not make either of these wishes an obstacle to the other; for he did not insist either upon ruining his whole purpose for the sake of the city, or upon fulfilling that purpose, and giving up the desire which he had to found the city; but maintaining both plans he gave the city its beginnings, and led his army on to Phoenicia. 76. The beginnings of the settlement were a shrine of Zeus Bottiaios founded by Alexander, and the citadel, which took the name of this fatherland and was called Emathia. And this I think was an indication of Alexander's purpose, namely that after the completion of his deeds he would choose this place in preference to his homeland.

77. Having celebrated such beginnings for the settlement, and counting therefore among our founders, he who was both called the son of Zeus, and made this name secure by his works, was translated swiftly to his father, and could not bring his plan to completion. And he who received the power after him—or rather among many successors was the only one worthy of Alexander's rank—Seleucus came to the city in place of Alexander, having won his power by valor not only once but a second time as well. 78. For indeed he came to the assistance of some, whom he made greater than their enemies; and then he was plotted against by those whom he had made strong. But being saved from the midst of this trap, he again roused admiration by giving his aid to still others. Finding these men just, he received due return from them. And this thanks was the return to him of the lands from which he had unjustly been driven out. 79. For Seleucus for his courage had been made commander of cavalry by Perdiccas; and when Perdiccas died in Egypt, and he was summoned by the Macedonians to take over Perdiccas' power, he went and held the satrapy of Babylonia. 80. And when Antigonus was warring against Eumenes, he joined him as an ally and assisted in the destruction of Eumenes, not knowing that Antigonus, whom he assisted, was an evil man. And then that man, when he had become great through the help of Seleucus, became jealous of his benefactor and plotted his death. From this point on, one of the gods must have held his hand over him, as in a drama; for he found the way to salvation through the same house which had plotted his destruction. 81. For just as Ariadne, smitten with the beauty of Theseus, saved the youth from the labyrinth with the ball of cord, Demetrius, son of Antigonus, admiring the valor of Seleucus, gave warning of his father's plot against him with a message which he wrote in the dust with the shaft of his spear, thus revealing what was to happen, and

at the same time escaping the notice of the others present. 82. From this time on Seleucus suffered the same fate as Evagoras, and a little later became powerful again. For he yielded to the circumstances of the moment and went away to Egypt; and there he established Ptolemy firmly in his kingdom, not providing him with a numerous army, but only with his own body and his own spirit; and after he had made Ptolemy's affairs secure, he persuaded Ptolemy to send him home, and receiving cavalry and foot troops, both to the number of a thousand, he drove his enemies out of Babylon, and won back his kingdom and his wife and children, and his former splendor. 83. And now, considering that while he had thus won back what belonged to him, justice was still due him for the treachery against him, he made war on Antigonus, and meeting him in Phrygia and conquering him, he slew him in open combat, thus exacting vengeance for the plot against himself; in this fashion he escaped the treachery like one dear to the gods, and returned vengeance for it like one who was practised in virtue.

84. So when Antigonus was dead, what had belonged to the vanquished passed to the victor, and the empire of Seleucus was bounded by Babylon on one side and by the confines of Egypt on the other. And now a time of production came, like that season which of old brought forth the beginnings of our city; but this season brought forth its great size. 85. And everything came to pass according to the divine will. There existed a city named for Antigonus, created by Antigonus. The distance between the present city and it was forty stadia. In this city, after his victory, Seleucus offered sacrifice; and when the bull was slain, and the altars were provided with everything according to custom, the fire seized on the offerings and burned freely. 86. And Zeus dispatched from his sceptre and sent to the altar his companion the beloved bird. It flew down into the midst of the fire, and seizing the thighs, wrapped in flame, carried them away. 87. And when this occurrence fixed the eye and attention of everyone, showing that what was done was not done without the gods, Seleucus put his son on his horse, to follow the flight from the earth, and to guide the horse along the route of the bird, wishing to know what the eagle would do with the things it had carried off. 88. And he, riding with his gaze fixed upward, was guided to Emathia by the flight of the bird. The eagle, descending there, placed the offerings on the altar of Zeus Bottiaios, which had been founded by Alexander, when the spring refreshed him; and it seemed to all, even to those not skilled in augury, that Zeus was advising that a city be built on the place. Thus Alexander's original desire for a settlement, and his beginning of the undertaking, moved toward completion; and the chief of the gods became our founder through his prophetic sign.

89. Then Seleucus collected artisans representing every skill, all sources of labor for assistance, and all the finest possible stones. Forests were cut down for roofs, and wealth was poured into the work of building. 90. Outlining the city, he stationed the elephants at intervals, at the places where the towers were to be, and to mark out the length and breadth of colonnades and side streets he used, for the dividing lines, wheat which had been brought by ships which stood in the river. 91. And quickly the city rose; and quickly what was built was filled with those who came down to the city from Ione, Argives and Cretans and the descendants of Herakles—who were, I believe, related to Seleucus through Temenus of old—and with the soldiers who followed Seleucus, who chose this place for their home. 92. Antigonia itself he obliterated, since it was a memorial of an evil man, and he removed hither the population, among whom were Athenians. These people who were resettled were at first fearful that they might suffer the anger which had been directed against Antigonus; but when they learned that they had been brought to a better lot in life, they honored Seleucus with a bronze statue, adding bull's horns to the head, this being the mark of Io.

93. From Seleucus the city took its surname, but its name from his father Antiochus, and while it was created by the former, it preserved the memory of the latter; for to the man, whom, of his family, he held the most in honor, Seleucus dedicated the most honored of his own works.

94. And this suburb, Daphne, much famed in song, Seleucus elevated to the dignity of a shrine, dedicating the place to the god, since he found that the myth was true. For Apollo, when he was enamored of Daphne but could not win her, pursued her; and as she was changed by her prayer into a tree, he transformed his loved one into a crown. 95. Thus was the tale sung; and the chase revealed to Seleucus the truth of the tale. For he once rode out to hunt, taking his dogs with him, and when he came to the tree which had once been a maiden, the horse stopped and smote the ground with his hoof, and the earth sent up a golden arrowhead. 95. This re-

vealed its owner by means of an inscription; for it was engraved "of Phoebus." I suppose that in his grief over the transformation of the maiden he shot all his arrows, and the tip of one, broken off, was hidden by the earth and was preserved for Seleucus, as a warning to adorn the spot and to consider it as what it actually was, a shrine of Apollo. 97. There was indeed the miracle in which, they say, the spring on Helicon was produced when Pegasus struck the rock with his hoof; but this event here was the more miraculous because it is more natural for springs than for the tips of arrows to spring up from the earth. 98. Seleucus however lifted the tip of the arrow and saw a serpent coming straight upon him, hissing with its head in the air. But as the serpent came on, it looked at him mildly, and vanished. When this serpent was added to the omens that appeared from the earth, his conviction grew that the god walked abroad in this place. And at once a sacred closure was laid out and trees and a temple were provided, and the grove speedily flourished and was guarded by strong prayers. 99. And Daphne was everything to Seleucus. For in addition to these signs from heaven which met his eyes, there also impelled him an oracle which he had received from Miletus, as support against his adversity, from which he had drawn courage. This oracle promised him coming good fortune, and commanded him, when he won the rule over Syria, to make Daphne sacred to the god. 100. Since he had thus prepared himself in respect to the things which concern the gods, and had made his beginning from the point which was proper, he started out from a foundation which offered good hope—good hope, I mean, of the favor of the gods, and good hope for our city; and he filled the finest part of the earth with cities, making the desert fair. For he did not found our city simply for purposes of enjoyment, but as a starting-point for other cities, so that instead of post-houses these cities stood at the service of travelers.

101. Other kings indeed take pride in destroying existing cities, but it was this man's glory to raise cities which had not existed. He planted so many on the earth that they were enough to bear the names of the cities of Macedonia and to be named also for the members of his family; thus there are many which are named for the same person, with both men's and women's names. 102. If one wished to judge him in comparison with the Athenians and the Macedonians, who are supposed to have founded the most colonies, he would prove not only to be the founder of still more, but to surpass each one of them in the size of his works to such a degree that any one of his cities was a match for ten of theirs. You may go to Phoenicia and see his cities there, and you may come here to Syria and see even more and greater ones of his. 103. He extended this fair work as far as the Euphrates and the Tigris, and, surrounding Babylon with cities, he planted them everywhere, even in Persia; in a word he left bare no place that was suitable for receiving a city, but in his work of spreading Hellenic civilization he brought the barbarian world quite to an end. 104. It is not, however, possible to say that, just as he founded many cities after this one of ours, so also did he place any other above this one; but he himself established his sceptre here and, so to speak, gave this city of ours a like right to rule over the others, since he built the others to be servants to this one, and found no other more worthy of the royal residence.

105. And so, having both lived and died among such works, Seleucus did not hand on his inheritance to weaker men, but they were all worthy men born of worthy men, and the sons always showed themselves emulous of their fathers in all things and especially in their love for their city. 106. As I enter now upon the works of these men, and gaze about, as though from a kind of observation point, on the nobility of each one, I cannot think either that silence concerning their virtues is right or that an enumeration of their virtues is possible; for the former would be the mark of a man who wished to harm both the rulers and the encomium of them, and the latter would be a greater task than could be undertaken by many mouths, or even by a whole chorus—even the greatest possible chorus—of sophists. 107. What way out of such a great difficulty, then, can one find? The following: to mention some rulers and to pass over others, or rather not to describe all their deeds, but to recount only a few of many; to make certain, concerning some of the kings, that they do not seem inferior to those who are mentioned; and to bid my hearers to test my discourse in the histories.

108. Anthiochus, then, the son of Seleucus, fought no war, since all his enemies cowered in fear, but it was granted to him to go on happily toward old age and hand on the realm undiminished to his son. Under his son too the weapons of war were at rest, there being no need of them; but instead there occurred a marvel of the greatest good omen for the city. 109. He

was in fact son-in-law of Ptolemy, the king of Egypt; and when Ptolemy came here he was smitten with the beauty of Artemis and desired that the statue should belong to his own land; and he took it and carried it off. The goddess was well cared for there, but she longed for our city, and so she visited with disease the wife of him who had carried her off, and showed her in dreams why this was being done. Then she was sent back again by those who had removed her, and recovered her old temple; but because of this episode her name was changed and she was called Eleusinia.

110. Another wondrous thing occurred in the same reign which was like to this, and yet not like it. It was similar in that it concerned the gods, but differed in that it involved the coming hither of foreign gods. I shall make plain what I mean. 111. In Cyprus there were gods honored who had had this dwelling allotted to them in Cyprus since the time when the land began to exist. These were seized with desire for this land of ours and were eager to migrate to it. They impelled the city [Antioch] to seek a response from the Pythian oracle, and persuaded Apollo to declare that there was only one solution for the city's difficulties, namely the migration of the gods of Cyprus to our land. 112. And the king sent to the island the men through whom he hoped to accomplish this. Then, since it was not possible either to carry them off openly or to tunnel into the temples secretly, they contrived the following plan. They said that they wished to fashion exact reproductions of the gods who were there. And when this was permitted, they worked at their carving lovingly night and day, while the priests remained at ease. The craftsmen carried the imitation to such a point of exactness that they removed the originals, and set the reproductions in their place, and embarked in sight of the people of Cyprus, bearing off the originals, as though they were the new statues, and leaving, in the guise of the originals, those which had just been created by their skill. 113. This success was not the result of the sculptor's skill, but of the gods' desire for the departure, for the sake of which they gave the craftsmen's hands more than their usual power. And what indeed—be it the winning of new lands or the raising of victorious trophies, or the destruction of an army or the capture alive of the enemy—brings more glory than to have the gods decide that it pleases them to sojourn in this land?

114. Indeed the incident which followed this, which occurred forthwith, in the time of the ruler who followed this one, brought proof of the same thing. Isis, the horned Egyptian deity, left Memphis and traveled hither, inciting Seleucus in dreams—the Seleucus who was fourth in succession after the first Seleucus—to send for her, and likewise moving Ptolemy to make a ready gift of the goddess; and the ships were seemly, and the statue was carried away. 115. And our city was a dwelling place of the gods, so that we could, if we wished, vie even with Olympus; for the residence of the gods there is a tale of the poets, while the situation here will convince all who see it.

116. And the conduct of the gods moved forward fittingly with the times, for when the power of Rome overshadowed everything, the city did not suffer from it in this respect, but they had much the same experience in connection with Zeus Kasios that Ptolemy did with Artemis; for they removed him, but he pressed them hard, loosing his thunder on everything, and procuring his return in this fashion; and he did return. 117. Thus it is clear that while some of the gods wished to come to us from other lands, those who were with us could not endure to be transferred elsewhere, but since by their beauty they had drawn to themselves the love of men, they experienced toward us that which they had done to others, and though they were drawn away by their lovers, they were seized and drawn back again by the land which they loved. So great was the love of the land which possessed our own deities, and the desire which impelled foreign deities to become our own.

118. I have dwelt at length on this history concerning the gods, because there is no other better subject for an encomium, either for ourselves or for any other men. If however one considers that deeds of arms are the sweetest to hear, many victories over many enemies come to our forefathers, and they went out themselves to war, as the manner of war then was.

119. And of the rest of our history, what needs to be mentioned? Antiochus, who received his name of Great because he undertook great things and was equal to them, thinking it was a small thing merely to conserve what he possessed, intended to add to what already existed. This he did by building, as an addition, the newer part of the city—that which the river flows about—which was not much smaller than the old; and he brought in Hellenic stock, Aetolians and Cretans and Euboeans, and he provided com-

plete security by means of a wall. 120. And just as he increased the size of the city, so also did he stretch the boundaries of his empire to greater size, as though weaving a larger garment for a body that has grown. And having inherited such a number of subjects that he could hope to gain all his desires either by terrifying his enemies or by the law of force, he went on step by step, winning everything in his way, some of his enemies giving themselves up voluntarily, while others learned from their defeats that it was not possible to resist. 121. In such fashion he advanced as far as Ionia, showing in both aspirations and deeds that he was the great Antiochus and that the glory of his name was not empty, but that he was worthy by reason of what he achieved to be called thus. From these achievements tribute kept coming to us and the city was adorned by the booty of the war—the city which cared for its subjects but defeated those who resisted it, though later it played the part of a good guardian for these latter, proving superior to the Persian dynasty in two respects, namely in its strength and in the character of its leadership.

122. Another Antiochus became king, a man at once peaceful in his way of life and warlike, rejoicing in peace, if no one became bold against him, but courageous in going to war, if any one forced him to it; and neither yielding to dishonest men, for the pleasure of being quiet, nor yet scorning a quiet existence simply for the sake of being mighty in war, but knowing, if ever man did, how to take to arms, in due season, and then to lay them aside again. 123. When a band of robbers had gathered in the Taurus who were plundering with impunity the property of the Cilicians, and were destroying the intercourse of men with each other, he fell upon them and made an end of them even more quickly than Minos drove the Carians from the Cyclades, and once more made it possible for the cities to communicate with one another, and by casting out the fear which hung over them he opened up the roads to the merchants. In gratitude for this he was commemorated in a statue, by those whom he had benefited, in which he was shown taming a bronze bull, the animal representing the mountain of the same name.

124. Now, having a number of things to relate concerning the remaining kings, but also trying, as I mentioned, to avoid giving annoyance in the length of my narrative, I will say only this, that just as they received their names in succession from each other, so they also inherited the excellencies of their ways, some maintaining the city in peace, others making it brilliant in war; but they all took careful thought for this one thing, namely that each of them should hand on enhanced the city which he had received. 125. One of them built the temple of Minos, another that of Demeter, still another that of Herakles, and others still built the shrines of other gods. The theatre was built by one, the bouleuterion by another; one ruler paved the streets and others brought the gifts of the Nymphs in conduits, some rulers bringing the waters from the suburbs of the city, while others conducted them to the newer part of the city from the springs with which the older part abounds. Temple was added to temple and the greater part of the city consisted of shrines, for the dwellings of the gods are one and the same thing, both an adornment of the city, and a guard over it. 126. But it is easier to measure the streams of the sea than to try to compass in words the number of additions with which each one raised the city to greater size. Wherefore, retreating from this impossible task, I shall list the surnames of each one, as an indication of the manner of his life. One was given the name of Soter, another Theos, another Callinicus, still another The Great, another Philopator, and another Epiphanes, and there was none who failed to share in the praise bestowed by such appellations. 127. And if it was an honorable custom among the Athenians, that of their statesmen one should be called The Just, and another something similar, how much of an honor does not come to our city when the kings are seen to be worthy of such epithets, and not merely one or two of them, indeed, but all of them in succession, and—what is even nobler—so great a number of them?

128. It is not only from our rulers that we have enjoyed the greatest benefits, but from their wives as well, who, leaving their looms, proved themselves superior to their sex as regards the city, enduring cares which belong to men, others honoring the gods by building shrines, and adorning the city by doing honor to it, as though they did not dwell with their husbands simply for the purpose of begetting children, but that they might imitate their traditional activities in labors for the city.

129. So long as it seemed good to the god to rule Asia according to the will of the Macedonians, this city was like an acropolis of the dynasty for them, and they dwelt here with good fortune and adorned this city with things brought from every-

where. Then when the god set an end to their rule, and began to bind everything to the empire of the Romans as though with a golden chain, they quickly perceived the decree made in heaven and received the change without complaint. The city was handed over without a struggle to those under whose power it was necessary for it to come, even if a fight had been made for it, and thus the city insured for itself a future free of ill will and gave no occasion for animosity. 130. Thus, in return for such intelligent understanding, the city enjoyed such great forethought on the part of its rulers, that it seemed that the character of the government was changed in race alone. Thus the bringing in of good things continued after the same fashion, not as though while certain men had built the city, others had taken it over, but as though the Romans were possessing what they had originally made, and were maintaining natural good will toward their own works. Thus they preserved, for the people of Antioch, the place of honor which they already possessed, and the honor which was paid to them by the people of Antioch, the Romans returned to them, and they did not deprive the city of its place as metropolis of Asia.

131. For those who suppose that our city has not been held in esteem from of old, let this be enough. For those who consider that it has sunk from a brilliant position, let its present circumstances merely be pointed out—but let envy not strike my discourse. There are some cities, indeed, which like old soldiers sing of their past deeds, lamenting their present fortunes; but with us, the things which are now to be seen rival our celebrated past, and there is no need to describe the city's past glories instead of pointing out its present ones.

132. Let one consider the city to see whether, like a musical composition, it is harmonious in all parts or whether, by Zeus, like some statue by one of the famous sculptors, it does not provide the necessary representation by merely a half of itself, but rather is one complete whole.

133. First let us look at the senate, since the whole structure of the city is based upon this as upon a root. This one alone is the greatest of those which exist everywhere, and the best, composed of men who can reckon up their fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers, and even beyond that, in the same rank, men who had their forebears as teachers of good will toward the city, each one of whom understood, when he took over his property, that it was necessary to hold his property for the common benefit. 134. For these men inherited their ancestral property by their good fortune, and spent it freely through their generosity, and through their industry they acquired many possessions; and just as the foundations of their wealth were blameless, they used it with all magnificence for the liturgies, avoiding poverty through their prudence, taking greater pleasure in spending for the benefit of the city than others take in amassing wealth, meeting expense so lavishly that there was fear lest they be brought to indigence, and making their outlays in varied forms, sometimes supporting the populace in times of need and wiping out the failures of the soil through their gifts, and always enriching the whole city through the enjoyment of baths and the pleasure of spectacles, introducing their sons, while they themselves were still living, to the bearing of liturgies; and by their magnificent generosity turning into occasions for spending money the immunities granted to them by the laws, spending their own wealth more lavishly than men who had never yet borne a liturgy. 135. For the feeling which elsewhere follows upon gain is here joined instead with spending, and a wealthy man would be more ashamed of fleeing a liturgy than he would be of diminishing his property through his liturgies. As though they had some god as a surety that whatever they lay out, double gain will come from Good Fortune, they spend lavishly on horse races and gymnastic contests, some according to their means, others more than is suitable for their means. 136. The object which each of those engaged in the liturgies strives for is to surpass his predecessor and to make rivalry impossible for his successor, and to bring forth in fairer fashion the things which are customarily performed, while adding new features to those which have been traditional. 137. Among us alone is there more competition over the undertaking of liturgies than there is among others in escaping them, and many men have often through expenditures sought to win their way to this honor, joining expense to expense, and making their way to the second outlay by means of the first, not purchasing, by means of small expenditures, an escape from greater ones, but by many outlays making their way to the spending of more. 138. The reasons for this is a certain innate high-mindedness, by reason of which they connot bear to have a greater report concerning other cities come to their own city than is carried abroad concerning it; for they consider their homeland to be without

reproach in the respects in which it is impossible to place it in the highest position.

139. So much wisdom and power of eloquence does the senate possess that you might say that it was a very band of sophists displaying their art in the prime of life. So sharp is their intellect and so rounded their speech and so sustained their discourse that many of the people who love to listen to these things gather at the law courts, as though at schools, to listen to their displays in the presence of the officials, which they produce on the spur of the moment with greater sureness than if they had been prepared. 140. This powerful eloquence compels the officials to make good their names, but not to exceed them so far as to behave like despots. What does this mean? Where a senate is ignorant, even though it be very wealthy, and has no means of expressing itself, it is easy for it to offend the governors in some things, while in other matters it has to endure in silence. For men who are unable, by means of eloquence, to win their just due, are exposed to unjust treatment, and though they be a senate in name, they suffer like slaves. 141. Among us the power of eloquence preserves the freedom of the senate in clear-cut fashion, and compels the administrators to appear in their tasks as what they are supposed to be, inciting sensible men to the discovery of what is best, and resisting the lawlessness of insolent men through the compelling power of wisdom, and through charm of rhetoric, so to speak, turning their hearts to gentleness. Thus our senators have come to possess a medicine which is stronger than the resources of the officials. 142. The senate does not make its entrance into the presence of the officials tremblingly, but these men summon it discreetly, when they are about to make their decision, since they are among men who are not easily to be overmastered, but offer examples of this justice to men who are able to judge. And these senators fight it out when a just man has been slighted, but render due praise when he is successful. It is a great thing, for our way of life, for an official to have the reputation, with the senate, of being resolved to administer justice. 143. In other cities, if the senators can check the vehemence of the governor, and are not themselves completely overwhelmed, they can think well of themselves; but among us, those governors who are of good repute consider that they have carried off the crown of virtue not when they have exerted their power over disobedient subjects, but when they have found praise among men with free spirits.

144. Thus the senators, in their dealings with their superiors, I should not say, do not strive with each other, but do all this for the common good. Divided into three parts, they have entrusted the leadership in each matter to the best man, and the rest follow these generals who are skilled in laboring for the benefit of their sections. 145. There is no question of some being allowed to speak while others are prevented from doing so, but license to speak is common to all, and all those present rejoice together with the man who utters some honest thing; youth speaks, and age is not angered, but quite the contrary, the old men request the young to speak and urge them on and bid them have courage, like eagles encouraging their young to fly. 146. The whole body of the senate has achieved so much dignity that as soon as it appears, whatever it wishes is carried out by the governors. And to the man who grants their wishes, the greatest pleasure is to have granted them; for he knows that he is dealing nobly with men who are both honest and powerful in discourse, whose honesty compels them to remember the good will, while their eloquence makes it possible to praise it justly.

147. Why indeed need one produce the governors as proof, when the emperors themselves hold this senate in respect both when it sends written communications and when it presents its arguments before the thrones? In these transactions the high-mindedness of the senate is exhibited to the ruler, and there has come to these men from the ruler, for their honor, rule over the provinces. 148. The charm of their own city has constrained some of these men to serve in the senate, and those to whom this has happened are honored by two things, first by having been called to these duties, and then by having chosen them. For in the one respect they showed that they were fit for office, and in the other they showed that they considered it a greater thing to live in their native land and be ruled than to leave it and rule others. 149. Thus they make it a pleasure, not a toil, to labor for their own city, and though receiving no relief from their burdens, they take pleasure in remaining with them, and some of them are honored by having avoided positions of authority, while others are honored by having ruled with the aid of the laws.

150. Concerning the commons, what greater thing could one say than that the commons is worthy of the senate, and that neither is it fitting

for the senate to be at the head of any other commons, nor for the commons to belong to any other senate among all that exist. Thus the one is the leader of worthy men, and the other follows the best men, like a skilfull chorus with an excellent leader. 151. In the first place each of them has a wife and child and all the possessions of a home. These things are powerful in teaching discretion and the love of quiet, just as those who do not possess them are prone to plunge into sharp disputes and snatch their swords and take pleasure in destruction, and whoever encounters misfortune pushes it off on someone else and runs away; many of these things are tolerated among the Egyptians and many of them in Italy, where some men make every word an excuse for an uproar, and others find their enjoyment when the senate falls into times of trouble. 152. But with us, the commons emulates the conduct of children toward their parents, and the senate emulates the conduct of fathers toward the commons; the senate does not permit want to fall upon the commons, and the commons in return brings its good will as its equivalent of wages paid for nurture, grieving for the distresses of the senate, but rejoicing mightily in its good times, sharing each kind of fortune and considering that there is nothing of the senate's which is not its own, and paying the sweetest debt of children for the security of their leaders.

153. One might perceive the character of the commons, if one scrutinized the disagreeable things which have come from them. For the things of which they could be accused would show their natural goodness, and the charge against them would amount to an encomium. Since we are a city, we must expect to suffer something from people who trouble the land; but the commons has been reproached for not hindering what occurs, not for having done something dreadful. 154. Thus being by nature far removed from evil, the commons is honored as the chastener of evildoers. What commons can approach ours in the matter of writing a covenant freely and keeping it faithfully? The sound of its voice is not given over to odious things, its gait is seemly, its robes are not slackly worn; it shows obedience toward its superiors and toward the well bred its manners are charming; it is polite in all things. In what other commons would one find these things? And to tell the truth, in what other senate, even, could one find such things? For that is how much our commons is superior to its name, and in the orderliness of its life it has progressed to a fairer station. 153. It is so superior in benevolence that the customs which among other people are subject to neglect with respect to one's own family, are practised even toward strangers by this commons. For when certain citizens had been brought here from another place on accusations whose penalty was death, and were being taken away to execution, the commons burst into tears and crowded round the palace in supplication, and their pleas halted the boiling passion of the governor of the day. 156. So they made their supplication because of their inclination toward pity, and he granted their request because they were worthy of such treatment; the cities possessed their citizens once more, the commons of Antioch had glory for having made their petition and for having been successful, and the governor had a fair name for having conquered his anger.

157. It is not possible to describe the extent to which excellence is native with us. The city has implanted in us courage in adversity, along with attentiveness to military skill; but the reign of law has put the former to rest, and our natural character has kept a watch over the latter. 158. For one thing, when the Persians came upon them, our ancestors did not think fit to save themselves by flight, but they held their ground, holding fast to their fatherland, more firmly than the Lacedaemonians did to their shields; and again when the usurper from Seleucia suddenly sprang up and fell upon us, the city held him in check, through the hands of the inhabitants, and these right hands, seizing the tools of the workshops, disarmed the soldiers who were accustomed to live amidst blood and slaughter.

159. Nothing actually forbids me to describe how that insurrection took place. Indeed, the excellence of the men who overcame it will thus be seen more plainly. There was a commander stationed at Seleucia with a troop of soldiers, deepening the entrance to the harbor. Perceiving that there were no soldiers stationed among us, and being put in a position of honor because of his labor about the port, and also being encouraged by the absence of any one to prevent him, he became enamored of the idea of setting himself up in power. And he did not delay, but put on the purple robe which was draped about the statue, and set to work. 160. In their march they fell upon the fields and laid waste everything through which they went; and by late afternoon they reached the city, bringing tidings of their own deeds, which one could learn merely by seeing these men. For the people were not going

to encounter a disciplined body of troops, but the most brutal attacks of armed men. 161. Then as they saw the usurper hastening to the palace and seizing the property of the rulers, the people took the outrageous nature of what they saw as their summons to action, and did not think fit to wait for night to take counsel, but considered that their only plan was not to yield; and putting forward their breasts instead of shields, and crowbars instead of spears, and thinking that whatever came to hand was a sufficient weapon, they beat down this would-be imperial power the same day, bringing down the first comers with such weapons as they had, and then using these men's arms against the rest. 162. And the women took part in the work, not merely with cries and weeping and stones hurled from roofs, as they did at Plataea, but going into hand to hand combat and tasting the line of battle and wounds, and confirming our belief in the story of the Amazons. And so some of the attackers were slain; others fled, and the rest were captured, and the insurrection did not last for a second day.

163. Such was the city when dangers threatened it; and in its character it kept alive the brave deeds of our forefathers. Let us see now whether it preserved the other virtues of the Athenians, whom it received as fellow settlers.

164. The greatest praise of them, indeed, is that they opened a common refuge to those who were deprived of their own lands, and strangers gathered toward Athens from all parts; but we, as Homer says, are far better than our fathers in this, for there is no city of which we have not received a part. Although we cannot say that we have received the greater number of its inhabitants from each city, nevertheless the people moving hither whom we have welcomed are not much fewer than those who remained in each place; some came from a desire for pleasant living, others for reasons of trade, others still in order to display their special skills, and others again to free themselves from poverty. 165. Disdain for their own city, which seems small, brings some; others are brought by both love of and flight from climate, for they both flee from their own, and love ours. Thus the people who are left behind in each city, when they come to us to make a visit, go about among their own fellow citizens, so many of their own people does each of them encounter. 166. Indeed, if a man had the idea of traveling all over the earth, not to see how the cities looked, but to learn their ways, our city would fulfill his purpose and save him his journeying. If he sits in our market place he will sample every city, there will be so many people from each place with whom he can talk. 167. As for those who have chosen this city in preference to their own, it is not to be held against them that they live away from home, but those who have stayed behind envy them, and blame themselves for not having emigrated. Thus a common enjoyment of good things is available to this city. The foreigners cherish as their home the city which they have chosen instead of their homes, while the fellow citizens of these foreigners do not think it meet to gain an advantage over them, but the city loves the virtues of those who come to it exactly as it does the virtues of its own children, imitating the Athenians in this also. 168. For just as they shared their leading men with the people of Pylos, and made use of the men of Pylos in their own highest offices, we too have done honor to foreigners in the greatest things, and have profited from foreigners, so that even now their families hold positions among the first.

169. Since the migrations to us began in antiquity and have not ceased—and I think they will not cease—the city has naturally grown. And this has been the clearest mark of individuality in the city, that the task of numbering its inhabitants can be performed only by the Pythian oracle, by which, according to the saying, the sands are counted. 170. It is so large and the whole of it covers so much territory that in each section it is equally thickly settled, whether you count over the regions outside the gates, or those just inside them, or the ones next to these, or whether you go to the center of the city and pass into the side streets and carry the search around into the farthest quarters, all of them are teeming with the same dense population; and the people who are going about in the midst of the city have all left the same number at home. 171. The Athenians, in fear of the Lacedaemonian attack, left Athens and crowded into the country demes, and the only population of the city was the desert in the agora; but among us, though the country districts, as though empty, have drawn to themselves many of the city people, the city still is crowded, and thus it is the same in the market place through the whole day, so that here the phrase "when the market place is full" does not mean just one certain part of the day, though it certainly means one particular part of the day elsewhere; for no one time of the day can

ever be called tranquil, but if you say that it is "full," you mean to indicate all times. 172. Just as is the case with rivers, in which rocks rising in the middle do not break the flow of the stream, but the current flows on in one unbroken aspect, so here the density of the people walking about allows no bare spot to appear in their midst, so that a man standing up above them for the first time and gazing at them would think that there were some festivals outside the city, at every gate, and that according to some custom the city was being emptied for them, the inhabitants dividing up according to their wishes. 173. In one respect only would one think that the city was unfortunate, namely that people who were in a hurry to go somewhere were impeded by the crowd which broke up those who came toward it, just as a ship is hindered in its course by the waves which press on to meet it.

174. Those who see the thickness of the population but do not know the fertility of the earth, would be apprehensive as to the provisions necessary for so many people. But one who heard of the fertility of the soil but did not know of the size of the population, would be astonished at the number of people by whom so much nourishment was consumed. So well suited to the fertile soil is the multitude in our city, and so well suited to the multitude is the nature of the earth; and because of this nature we have never been compelled to dishonor Zeus Xenios through any harshness concerning strangers, even though we have the example of Rome, which, whenever any scarcity of the necessities of life occurs, turns this to abundance by driving out the foreigners. 175. The earth has never driven us to such a remedy as this, nor is there a time when the city has deprived itself of its crowd of inhabitants in order to save the rest, keeping up its old custom, I think, of solving troubles for strangers, not creating them, since the time when this land brought back to sanity the son of Agamemnon, who had raged through all the rest of the world after the killing of his mother, pursued with all their might by the goddesses who punished the youth with madness. For when he went to the mountains there, the sickness was cured, and the place has come to bear the appropriate name.

176. But I do not know how I have been carried away to this point by the pleasant tale concerning the son of Pelops; now the discourse must be brought back to the examination of the strength of this land, one sufficient sign of which is that it is adequate in every way for those who live in it, while another indication I shall now make plain.

177. When this last Persian war was unchained, for which the Persian government had been preparing for a long time, and when the emergency called for adequate counter preparation to match the threat, and, even more than for preparations, called for a place capable of receiving all those things that such a war requires, this land of ours is the one that rose above the emergency with its abundance and collected the forces to its bosom and sent forth the entire army, when the time called. 178. For there flowed to it, like rivers to the sea, all the soldiers, all the bowmen and horsemen and the horses, both those of the fighting men and those carrying burdens, and every camel and every band of soldiers, so that the ground was covered with men standing and men sitting; the walls were covered with shields hung up and spears and helmets were to be seen everywhere; everything resounded with hammering and noise and whinnying, and there were so many units stationed here that their officers alone would have added no small population to the city, or rather such a great army was gathered that in other places the drinking water would have been exhausted; but everyone received the soldiers as pleasantly as though they were caring for a kinsman who came for a visit after a long interval; and each one fared as well from the land as though behind each dwelling the area had been transformed automatically into the semblance of a cavern filled with provisions; and it was possible in this way for men to be nourished to satiety, so that it seemed that it was not human intention or labor which provided the foresight or the service, but as though the gods, as the power of gods is, prepared everything in unseen fashion. 179. Wherefore the Persians blame us especially among their enemies because we provide this city as a base of operations which rivals the warlike prowess of the emperor, and we have nowhere diminished his eager courage by any deficiency of the help which we supply. 180. Thus the city to the emperor, is like a loved one; when he is absent from it, it is as though from his native land, and he turns his mind back to it and he makes his return to it a matter serious enough to involve the taking of an oath, and he lightens his absence with letters, and undertakes war after war without pause, eagerly seeking, by means of his labors in the west, to have a sight of the east, and then by his labors in the east, to have a sight of our city. Indeed he has not gone elsewhere,

except in so far as warfare had compelled him to, but in truth has spent the pleasantest part of his time here, taking his pleasure as though in the arms of a loved one.

181. But now is it possible to admire the vigor of the city, as one would the strength of a man's body, and to find cast into neglect the matter of eloquence, which is rightly called the mind of a city? For indeed it is this which, when a city is large, makes it more revered, and if it does not happen to have become so large, at any rate puts it in a position to be admired. 182. Just as, while everything else at Athens was brilliant—the war vessels, the sea battles, the rule over many people—the most important thing was the desire for knowledge, and honor of it, and acquisition of it, even so with us nothing is beyond being wondered at and everything is inferior to the love of knowledge. 183. It seems to me that the god, when he divided the earth into two parts, did so with the desire to adorn each part equally and to preserve the balance, as though in a team of horses; so that he commanded Hermes to plant here seeds of eloquence which should not be inferior to those of Attica, and with his rod to incite men to the possession of this eloquence. 184. Wherefore, just as in former times the fortunes of Greece were divided between two cities, Sparta and Athens, today the fair possessions of the Greeks are divided between two cities, ours and Athens—if indeed a man is to be called a Greek because of his eloquence rather than his birth. 185. Indeed these two cities have held high the torch of eloquence, the one illuminating Europe, the other Asia. In the first place this city has had come to it such a splendid quality of students that, even if they are not to be considered worthy of the teaching here, they are at least worthy of that in Athens, so great is the force of some, and the youthful freshness of others. 186. Thus swarms of young men more numerous than bees have come together here. And for another thing, no one goes away in disgrace, but when they have completed their studies sufficiently, some of them have remained, while others have gone away, the former bound by bonds of love toward the city which has given them the riches which they have acquired, while the latter bear home their intellectual accomplishments as salvation for their native cities. Again, the brilliance of those who have returned home impels others to the same initiation, and some send on their children, others their brothers, some their neighbors and others their friends, in a word, all their fellow citizens.

187. You have indeed become the metropolis of Asia not so much by the exalted nature of your position as by the fact that the thing which is of all the most useful comes into the possession of all men here. For wherever you go and find a senate which is armed with eloquence, and speakers discoursing without blemish, you will find either that they were all trained in the schools here, or most of them, or in any case not a few. 188. By means of their skill in the tribune and their services in lawsuits they arrive at the rank of judge, and we furnish the provincial people with the finest orators and judges, who, guiding the cities with their wisdom, gain one thing alone—namely the honor of being worthy of these tasks—and depart with empty hands, crowned with good repute. And you, perceiving these things, build shrines of the Muses with great lavishness, both for the education of young men and as a gift of honor for the goddesses, and you employ your fellow citizens as teachers and still are not jealous of strangers. 189. And with your benevolence is mingled the exactness of our discipline in oratory; the fact that we furnish councils to all men shows our benevolence, and the fact that we give praise to those alone to whom it is fitting demonstrates the nature of our discipline. 190. When they call, you join them; but when they make a mistake, you do not cover it up, but a weak thought and a botched figure and a spoiled phrase are at once detected. A common demonstration of the error rises from every side and it is impossible for a man who had been struck and transfixed in this fashion, if he looks toward any part of the auditorium, in ignorance of the nature of his audience, to quiet the uproar of the judgement; but wherever you look, an exact correction is provided. 191. For aside from the education which is carried on among the citizens, there are three bands of rhetoricians, equal in number, which gather in the law courts, with their hearing no less whetted for judgment than their tongues are sharpened for speaking. Thus, no one is happier than when justice is pronounced here, while in unhappiness they are all second only to the man who is condemned. And indeed whoever enters these courts without trembling and fear does so, not because he is a brave man, but because he is ignorant, not knowing into what great danger he is coming. 192. Thus from of old the use of eloquence has been deeply rooted

here and it has gone forward through a uniform high development. Both those who come to these courts from outside, and those who are seized by them within the city are able to share the springs of eloquence, so that the belief now prevails that whoever comes to this land tastes the art and comes to have a share in rhetorical accomplishment, as though the earth gave forth the spirit of the Muses, just as in some other places it gives forth a prophetic spirit.

193. It is not astonishing, then, if a city which is superior to others in every other respect, but in the practice of wisdom surpasses not only other cities but even itself, should make those who come to rule it into its lovers. For each one of these the beginning and middle and end of his tenure is directed toward the addition of some thing to the city. And indeed the men for whom it has been possible to make gifts, like those who set up the greatest offerings to the gods, spend the rest of their lives in happiness, possessing, in their intercourse with men, that which they consider the fairest thing of all; or rather they are able to say all the things which can make a man splendid, while even if they kept silent concerning everything else, they would be confident of being honored in this one respect, namely that oblivion would never overtake them, since their works stand in the fairest of all places under the sun. 194. It is right that they should be confident. For the man who holds the most courts, showing the earnestness of his mind, has made his glory imperishable, just like those painters, I think, who dedicated the skill of their hands at Delphi. And it is not true that those governors who were able to do so with imperial funds, easily undertook additions to the city, while those to whom the expense would be personal shrank from it; but those who formed a part of the group which surrounded the emperor were more enamored of spending money than of making it, and collecting handsome stones from everywhere they sprinkled beautiful buildings about in the city so that they shone forth like stars; and becoming leaders in splendor, they had many followers who desired ever more brilliant effects. 195. Here, the man who does not build a house, or take pleasure in those which he has, if he be very rich, is considered to be rich in vain; but the man who provides these things, counts himself among the fortunate even though he be in straits in other respects. Because of this the measure of the city does not stand still, but like the human body grows daily.

196. And now it is the proper time to describe the situation and size of the city, for I think that there can be found none of those which now exist which possesses such size with such a fair situation. Beginning from the east it stretches out straight to the west, extending a double line of stoas. These are divided from each other by a street, open to the sky, which is paved over the whole of its width between the stoas. 197. These are stretched out to such a length that merely to pave such a space would require a great force of men, while to go to the end from the beginning is a toil, which requires the help of horses; thus gently sloping and unbroken is it throughout, unchanged either by mountain streams or by steep slopes, or any other kind of difficulties, as in a picture in which the colors combine according to their natural values. 198. Side streets begin from the stoas, some running to the north through the completely level area; the others, which run to the south toward the first slopes of the mountain, rise gently, extending the inhabited area to such a distance that it preserves harmony with the scheme of the remainder of the city but is not, by being raised too high, cut off from it. 199. For the city did not, by crossing streams and ravines and including these within itself, and taking a little space in the very middle of the side of the mountain, place overhanging houses there, a source of alarm to those who dwell below, like the rock of Sisyphus; but by embracing only so much as permitted unbroken progress, it preserved the graceful proportions of the larger part of the city. 200. The mountain rises up, stretched out beside the city like a shield raised high in defence, and the last dwellers upon the lower slopes of the mountain have nothing to fear from the heights, but they have the sources of every happiness, springs, plants, gardens, breezes, flowers, the songs of birds, and the enjoyment of spring earlier than the others have it.

201. The stoas have the appearance of rivers which flow for the greatest distance through the city, while the side streets seem like canals drawn from them. Some of the side streets, which face toward the mountain, lead to the charms of the slopes; the others, which face the other way, lead to another street, which is unroofed but built upon on both sides, just like canals made for the cross passage from river to river. The former section ends in many places among charming gardens; the latter streets come to an end at the bank of the River Orontes.

FIG. 1. Restored plan of the city of Antioch, originally published in C. R. Morey, The excavation of Antioch-on-the-Orontes, *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* **76**: 638, 1936, and reproduced later in the same author's *The mosaics of Antioch* **17**, New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1938.

202. About in the middle of the right hand stoa of those which, as I have said, are stretched out from the east to the west and extend over as much length as would be sufficient for three cities, apses facing in all directions, with one roof of stone, form, as the beginning for other stoas which run toward the north as far as the river, the shrine of the Nymphs, which stands about the stoas, high as heaven and turning every eye with the dazzling light of its stones and the color of its columns and the gleam of its pictures and the wealth of its flowing waters. Side streets begin from these stoas just as from those [ of the main street ] which I first described.

203. Such then is the form of the old city. The new city stands on the island which the division of the river formed. Flowing from above in one stream, and keeping this form for the most part, it divided itself, and surrounding this place, made it an island. One of the streams flows between the two cities, while that on the other side of the new city proceeds, after having

formed the island, to unite its course, and makes the river again the same as it was before it was parted. 204. The form of this new city is round. It lies in the level part of the plain, the whole of it in an exact plan, and an unbroken wall surrounds it like a crown. From four arches which are joined to each other in the form of a rectangle, four pairs of stoas proceed as from an omphalos, stretched out toward each quarter of the heaven, as in a statue of the four-handed Apollo. 205. Three of these pairs, running as far as the wall, are joined to its circuit, while the fourth is shorter but is the more beautiful just in proportion as it is shorter, since it runs toward the palace which begins hard by and serves as an approach to it. 206. This palace occupies so much of the island that it constitutes a fourth part of the whole. It reaches to the middle of the island, which we have called an omphalos, and extends to the outer branch of the river, so that where the wall has columns instead of battlements, there is a view worthy of the emperor, with the river flowing below and the suburbs feasting the eyes on all sides. 207. A person who wished to describe this part carefully would have to make it the subject of a discourse, but it cannot be a part of a discourse on another subject. Nevertheless, one should say at least that to the other palaces which exist in every part of the world, some of which are praised for their size and others for their beauty, it is in no way inferior; but it is far superior to many, nowhere surpassed in point of beauty, and in size surpassing all others, divided into so many chambers and stoas and halls that even those who are well accustomed to it become lost as they go from door to door. I believe that, if this palace stood by itself in some insignificant city, such as are numerous in Thrace, where a few huts form the cities, it would give the one that possessed it good reason to claim a proud position in the catalogue of cities.

208. But I return to that point where I was saying that the river flowing between them separates the new from the old city. What is divided in this way is, however, united by five strong bridges. Thus the water makes our city two, but the bridges do not allow it to be two, joining the second to the older, like a colt to its mother. 209. Let one consider, indeed, that if it is best for a city to be stretched out at length, our old city is built in this way; or if the circular plan is more fitting, the new city has this; or if it is itself a mark of greatness that the city is not all of one form, here if anywhere are all shapes of cities, so that a man who glories himself upon dwelling in a city which is uniform in shape on all four sides must realize that he takes pride in an insignificant thing. 210. Just as in the case of farms, where a small plot of land can easily be elaborately adorned, like the works of painters, while the estates of the wealthy will not sustain this, but when they are intensively cultivated one part of them recedes into the background while another stands out in the foreground, even so, in the case of cities, the one which is wanting in size has a unified form, while that which is large develops according to circumstances.

211. In speaking of size, I cannot omit to say that if to the length of the stoas which I first mentioned one were to join those which run from them to the river, thus making an addition to the length in one direction or the other; and if again, by adding to each other in the same way those of the new city so as to make them one, a person were to increase the first length by adding this one to it—if one put these together, or rather each thing would remain as it was, for one would calculate the change only in computation—one would find that the stoas occupy the space of a day's journey. 212. As you go through these stoas, private houses are numerous, but everywhere public buildings find a place among private ones, both temples and baths, at such a distance from each other that each section of the city has them near at hand for use, and all of them have their entrances on the stoas. 213. What then is my purpose in this? And the lengthening of my discourse, entirely about the stoas, to what will it bring us? It seems to me that one of the most pleasing things in cities, and I might add one of the most useful, is meetings and mixings with other people. That is indeed a city, where there is much of this. 214. Truly, it is good to speak, and to hear is better and to converse is best, and to add what is fitting to the fortunes of one's friend's, rejoicing with them in some things, sorrowing with them in others, and to have the same return from them; and in addition to these there are ten thousand things in being near to one another. 215. People who do not have stoas standing thus before their houses are scattered by the winter; and although they can be said to live in one city, they are actually separated from one another not less than those who live in different cities, and they learn news of those who dwell near them as they would of

those who are living abroad. Indeed they are kept in their houses by rain and hail and snow and winds almost as though they were prisoners, and only the slaves, who have of old learned to endure hardship, dash off bent over to market. So when the weather clears up they greet and embrace one another like people arrived safe from a long voyage, having been forced to neglect with regard to one another many things which the law of friendship prescribes, but blaming, instead of themselves, the things by which they were hindered. 216. With us, however, Zeus is not thus; he does not send sharp hail, or thick snow, or heavy rain, by which the even flow of association is broken up; while the year takes its changes from the seasons, association is not altered by any season, but the rain beats upon the roofs, and we, walking about in the stoas at our ease, sit together where we wish. 217. Those who live at the far ends of the side streets are protected by eaves which project from the walls on each side of the street, and these bring them, safe from the rain, to the stoas. So, with other people, the habit of society is dulled in proportion to the distance by which they are separated; with us, friendship grows by the unceasing nature of our association, and here it increases in the same proportion that it declines elsewhere.

218. Thus the stoas do not contribute to pleasure any more than they do to those things which are of the greatest importance among men; and to these stoas are added the hippodrome and the theatre and the bath, the one large enough to be filled with the running horses and to furnish seats to the multitude of the city, thanks to the abundance of the tiers, and the other re-echoing and assisting it in giving pleasure, with the flute, the lyre, song, and the many forms of enjoyment which the stage provides. 219. Who, in reviewing the different forms of places of assembly elsewhere, could find places such as we have, some made for the contests of athletes, others for those of men against wild beasts, and all these in the middle of the city, not forcing one to spoil one's pleasure beforehand by the length of the journey to them? 220. But who could not admire the baths? Some are fitted for the winter, others designed for the summer: the former are sheltered from harsh winds, the latter seem as though they were built in high airy places and not connected with the earth. 221. Of the houses, some are being built in the elaborate style of today, while those of former times avoid, with their moderate style, both display and the servility which it produces in others.

222. If I must not be silent about that which comes next, it was Zephyros, I believe, who brought it about that the citizens in past times did not spend all their efforts on their homes. People who are not fortunately situated with regard to the breezes have to contrive by artificial means the pleasure which they get from them; but we, who enjoy the sweetest of breezes and have a good companion, as Homer says, in Zephyros, have no need of ingenuity, when the god himself gives the enjoyment to us. 223. The Athenians had as an ally at sea Boreas, who gave them this gift, as the story goes, in compensation for the maiden whom he had carried off—and the gift that the son-in-law gave was not too temperate either. In our case, however, Zephyros does not benefit us after first having injured us, but he loves, not a maiden indeed, but the whole city, with undying love; and restraining himself in the winter because he knows that if he comes then he will grieve us, he arrives with the summer, to check the heat. 224. He does not visit any other city before ours, nor does he pass through us to another city, but he both begins with us and ends with us, among people moved only to the contemplation of one beauty, whose eyes would not be diverted by the appearance of any other thing. 225. He both flows about the whole city and leaves nothing untouched by his aid. He does not stream only into the mansions of the rich and into houses of three stories, and remain suspended above lower houses and those which belong to the poor, but just as in democracy there are equal rights with regard to the laws, so with us there is an equal share, so to speak, in the pleasures of the wind, and no one parched for the breeze has ever complained that it was because of his neighbors that he suffered thus. So the wind flows everywhere and slips through everything, and wherever it turns, there is a way open for it. 226. Some people have come to be deprived of the rays of the sun because a house nearby casts its shadow on them; the wind, however, is prevented by nothing from giving pleasure everywhere, but it blows the tunics of those who walk about and twists around their legs, while the bedding arches about the bodies of those who sleep as the wind blows under it; thus the west wind makes night a double rest by adding the breeze to sleep.

227. Thus it is not without reason that the

city is always filled with building activity; some buildings are being torn down, some are half completed, and for still others the foundations have just been laid or are being excavated. Everywhere are the cries of those urging on the workmen, and ground that last year was planted with vegetables is built upon this year. Men know, indeed, that here they have, while still alive, all the things which the poets promise to the righteous dead.

228. Let us only consider, indeed, how the city would have been four times the size it now is, if it had not already been stricken on three occasions. Just as the temple of Pythian Apollo has suffered many fortunes, and the present shrine, standing upon those which have disappeared, is the fourth, just in the same way our city, as a city of mortals, has been smitten, and as one dear to the gods has risen up, suffering and rising again even as the olive of Athena. For Xerxes destroyed it with fire, when he ravaged the acropolis of the Athenians, and on the second day a shoot rose up from the burned tree to the height of a cubit. This city likewise has been destroyed and renewed at the same time. 229. Thus today, when you excavate in order to lay a foundation, everywhere you meet some trace of former times, and many people, using what has been preserved instead of what they intended to use, add their other material and build. So if some buildings had not been destroyed and others built on them, and if as much as is now used for rebuilding were employed instead for enlargements, many people would now be deprived of much land which is now under cultivation.

230. But the city is not thus wonderful in every respect, with, at the same time, suburbs of such a nature that one thinks they ought to be better than they are, declaring, however, that this is the case precisely because they belong to a city such as this. Indeed they are large and populous towns, with greater population than not a few cities, using the services of artisans even as in towns and sharing their goods with one another by means of the festivals to which they invite the others and are invited, each one in turn summoning the others to it. They enjoy and take pleasure in the same things, and profit by sharing with others their surplus and gaining in return what they need, selling some things and buying others, more fortunate by far than those who trade by sea, since they earn their wealth with laughter and bustle instead of among the waves and breakers, needing few of the city's products because of the commerce among themselves. 231. Let one count over also what lies outside the gates. He will not think fit to call these places merely collections of people, but will call them the tribes of the city, just as though they were a part of this city alone, for it is to such a degree as this that the regions outside the city are exactly suited to the tastes of one who admires what is inside, in luxury and baths and in the products of craftsmanship and in social intercourse. Thus, if one were to bring together into one form what is now divided into three, the part which is now before the city would be sufficient to be a city itself. 232. Just as the district in front of the palace shares the grandeur within, even though it is itself inferior to what is within, and enables one to infer the greater by means of the lesser, thus a certain likeness has been passed out from the city to the regions before the walls, so that as you go out you feel that you are seeing on a smaller scale what you have left, and as you come into the city what is inside is foreshadowed by the things outside. 233. All these suburbs are of the same form, but that towards the west, Herakleis, excels all possible appreciation just as it excels all other places. The only thing that is worthy of this is to see it, for if you heard the most glowing description of it you would not hear as much as is worthy of it. 234. As soon as you pass through the gates, on the left are varied gardens and charming inns and an abundance of springs and houses hidden in trees and chambers which rise above the groves and luxurious baths, a place worthy of Aphrodite and her son the archer. As you go on you see on both sides of the road a wealth of vineyards and beautiful houses and rose gardens and plants of all sorts and streams; one thing draws you to it and another draws you away again, and it is through such pleasures that you come to the supremely beautiful Daphne. 235. About this nothing worthy has yet been said, nor will it ever be said, unless, indeed, it should happen that the god himself with the Muses should sing of the place. 236. This road from the city I might most appropriately call the tassel of the aegis which Homer gives to Athena; thus golden is the whole road, and it ends at the golden final perfection, Daphne.

236A. When a man sees this he cannot but cry out and leap for joy and skip and clap his hands and bless himself for seeing the sight, and, so to speak, soar on wings from pleasure. One

thing from one side and one thing from another enchants and astonishes; one thing holds one, and another tears one away, and there pours upon the spectator's eyes an arresting brightness, the temple of Apollo, the temple of Zeus, the Olympic stadium, the theatre which furnishes every pleasure, the number and thickness and height of the cypresses, the shady paths, the choruses of singing birds, the even breeze, the odors sweeter than spices, the stately aqueducts, the vines trained to form banqueting halls—these are the gardens of Alcinous, the feast of Sicily, the horn of Amaltheia, a veritable Sybaris. No matter what bath you choose before the others to bathe in, you will overlook a more delightful one. 237. The place is so helpful to the body that, if you leave after even a brief stay, you will go away healthier than when you came; and if you were asked by what you were most pleased, you would be at a loss for an answer, for it is to such a degree as this that every pleasure in Daphne rivals every other pleasure. No suffering is so powerful or so unconquerable or so long-standing that Daphne cannot drive it out, but as soon as you come to the place, the pain disappears. If the gods ever really leave heaven and come to earth, I believe they must come together and hold their councils here, since they could not spend their time in a fairer place. 238. The things which I have described are not of such a number that the supremeness of the beauty destroys the wonder of it because of the small number of the objects which share the beauty, as for example in a place where there are only five houses, seven gardens, three hundred cypresses, and three baths; but these things in Daphne are fair as such things are nowhere else, and they surpass other things in number and size even more than in beauty. 239. Indeed it [Daphne] possesses each of these things in such a number that the fact that it is spoken of merely in the class of a suburb is to the shame of a city which, if it wished to dispute with other cities, has so many things by which it may win, which has had also so many visitors from among the Romans, and has triumphed by convincing them that Italy can no longer boast of such things as though it were unsurpassed.

240. The chief of the beauties of Daphne, and I think of the whole earth, are the springs of Daphne, for nowhere else has the earth made it possible either to see or to use such springs. These are the palaces of some Nymphs, and it is their gift that the waters are of the purest and clearest. 241. One would say, indeed, that the goddesses do not take less pleasure in the place than Zeus does in Pisa or Poseidon in the Isthmus, Apollo in Delphi, or Hephaestus in Lemnus. And if one must believe that the Nymphs have their dwelling in waters, I believe they may visit other waters, but only to see them, and that this water, like kings, they have made to serve as their citadel. I believe also that story that the three goddesses, when they held the contest of beauty, came hither to have the judgment, when they had bathed, rather than to the place where they are commonly said to have held the contest. 242. Who, standing at the first outlets of the springs and gazing on the water flowing out and borne along both walls of the temple, could fail to admire the abundance of the water, to be struck with its beauty, to honor it as divine, and to take pleasure in touching it, greater pleasure in bathing in it, and the greatest pleasure of all in drinking it? It is cold and clear and most drinkable, and endowed with benefits and pleasant to apply to the body. 243. The water has not remained at its source alone, nor did Daphne create it and Daphne enjoy it alone, keeping the gift with her, but she brought it to light and the city shares it with her who brought it to light, for the waters run from one of their homes to the other, and not from a foreign origin, in which case there would be much trouble and much danger if the benefit were received from the kindness of others; but contriving a covered road for the stream through the lower slopes of the mountain, in some places hollowing out the slopes, in others building additions, and in some places carrying the way in the air over bridges, where the cliffs make this necessary, men bring to the town the abundance from the suburbs.

244. Indeed the thing by which especially we are supreme is the fact that our city has water flowing all through it, for even though one were to behave insolently toward us in respect to other things, nevertheless all must yield when the waters are mentioned. We surpass the beautiful waters of other cities by the abundance of ours, and the abundant waters of other cities by the beauty of ours, or rather we surpass the inexhaustible waters of other cities by the abundance of ours, and the pleasing waters of other cities by the beauty of ours. Each of the public baths pours forth a stream as large as a river; some of the private baths have as great a stream as these, and the others are not far behind them. 245.

Whoever has the means to erect a bath on the site of earlier ones does so the more confidently because of these streams, and he does not fear that it may be brought to the point of perfection and then called thirsty because of deficiency of water; but it is so far from being the case that one is deterred from the undertaking by lack of water, that a person who has not a great impulse will be incited by the waters themselves. Wherefore all the tribes of the city pride themselves on the particular adornments of their baths more than on their very names. These baths are finer than the public baths just in proportion as they are smaller, and there is much contention among the members of the various tribes that each of their tribes possesses the finest bath. 246. One can judge the wealth of our waters by the number of the houses, since there are as many fountains as there are houses, or rather there are many fountains in each house, and indeed the majority of the shops are also adorned in this way. 247. Wherefore we do not wrestle and box about the public fountains to see who shall draw water before the next person, although this troubles many of the wealthy cities, whose citizens have much pushing about the fountains and complaints about broken jars, and blows in addition to torrents of words. But with us, since everyone has water flowing within his house, the public fountains flow merely for display. 248. The clearness of our water you can test easily if you will fill a pool and then stop the water from running into it. The bottom will be covered by the water so transparently that you will think that the pool is empty. Thus I know not whether the sight is more able to set fire to thirst or to put an end to it, for it both invites one to drink and cheers one before he drinks.

249. But the things about which you are wont to engage in friendly rivalry make your contest futile because it is equal on all sides, for it is to such a degree as this that you, who clearly surpass all others, remain, with respect to each other, on equal terms. 250. Those, for example, who live in the eastern portion of the city say that the greatest part of the wheat is brought through their quarter, and at the same time they bring forward the spring of Alexander. Those who live in the western quarter boast of the wealth of trees and the greater cleanliness, and of that pleasantest of neighbors, Daphne, while those who live on the slope of the mountain boast of the finer breezes and the peacefulness and the view over the whole city. Those who live in the new city boast of the wall, the island, the palace, and the symmetry of the whole, while those who live in the middle of all these boast of being in the middle. Who, hearing these things, could make a choice when all of them, one after the other, are so equally matched?

251. But may none of the gods ever take away from us this rivalry which is caused by the fact that the advantage lies with each of us. What is more inexhaustible, more lasting, than the wealth of goods which we have for sale? These are so distributed through the whole city that no one part of the city can be called the market; neither must those who wish to buy things come together in any one place, but the goods are right before everyone, before their very doors, and everywhere it is possible for one simply to stretch out his hand in order to take what he wishes. 252. One cannot find any street so despised or so remote that it sends elsewhere, lacking something of what they need, those who dwell in it, but the middle of the town and the furthest quarters are equally well supplied, and they are all as full of goods for sale as they are of people. 253. Many of these goods one has often passed by, not needing them, but for things which he needed, no one has ever sought in vain. Things contrived for enjoyment vie with necessities, and there is a place in the city for both conditions of fortune. It both protects poverty and gratifies the desires of the wealthy, furnishing delicacies for the enjoyment of the latter, and for the former providing things fitted to their needs. Thus it does not fall short of the requirements of the one class and is not superior to the needs of the other. The finest thing of all is that with its care it shelters poverty in many ways, and does not merely grant the means of getting a bare existence, but adds the means of doing so enjoyably. 254. One may understand the superiority of our trade from the following circumstance. The cities which we know pride themselves especially on their wealth exhibit only one row of goods for sale, that which lies before the buildings, but between the columns of the stoas no one works; with us, however, even these spaces are turned into shops, so that there is a workshop facing almost each one of the buildings. These are wooden huts, with brushwood for the roofs, and no space is without some handicraft; but if a man gets possession of a little strip of space, it at once becomes a tailor's shop or something of that order, and people cling to such places as they would to ropes, like

Odysseus to the wild fig tree. 255. Although the supply of things for sale is brilliant, it is even more of a subject for wonder because it is inexhaustible, so that those who make their purchases in the early morning get nothing more than those who buy in the evening, but just as you find the water always the same when you need it, the markets are always the same for your enjoyment, and nightfall does not cut short the height of the activity, but there is a greater din in our city than there is among the Ethiopians. 256. They, as the god approaches, offer what they call the table of the sun, filled with meat; and although the work is that of those in authority, who set the meat upon the table at night, they pretend that this is the offering which the earth makes itself. With us, the time when the goods are prepared is unknown, for they are seen only in their final perfection, and the day claims no advantage over the night, but all things remain in equal abundance in both. 257. Thus the travelers who draw near when it has grown dark in the last stage of their journey push on to the city in good spirits, since they know they will fare well here even at night. It is possible for them both to bathe and to dine more magnificently than men invited to feasts of victory after games, just as if the cooks had been sent ahead to make preparations. 258. Everything is at once available, and it is not necessary to hurry about in search of fish, but only to listen for the peddlers as they shout. Indeed, we who live on land enjoy more fish than many of those who are tossed about on the ocean, and although we are separated from the sea, the fishermen catch for us in their nets the creatures of the sea, and crowds of fishes of all kinds come into them every day. 259. Another fine thing here is that the needy are not deprived of this kind of food. Tyche, who has distributed fitting things to each man, has given to the wealthy the products of the sea, to the others those of the lake, and to both in common has given the river, which nourishes for the wealthy the kind of fish which comes up to it from the sea, and for the others the other kinds, all of them in abundance.

260. The profit to the city from the river and the lake is not simply so much as to adorn its table, but they bring to the city as many things as the earth gives, making the movement of them easy and not restricting the carrying of the crops so that it is limited to beasts of burden. They divide the country between them, and the one, which flows through the parts which have not the lake as an ally, and the other, which extends before those parts which the river does not assist, between them, with the sailors of the lake and those of the river, empty the fields into the city. 261. At first they bring the goods separately; then the river takes the place of both, receiving, along with its own products, what is carried through the lake, and bringing these to the very center of the city. It delivers the cargoes to each person before the gates, so that it is possible for the women and children to unload the freight. Here we have the opposite of what happens in Thesprotia, for there the river flows into the lake, while here the river receives the lake. 262. What is of the greatest importance, however, is that the river, as it flows to the sea after leaving the city, is not impassable to ships because of rocks, which has often happened to the Nile, nor is this part of the stream useless to us, but it is worthy of Pindar's praise of the Hipparis of Camarina, which "swiftly weldeth together a soaring forest of steadfast dwellings," furnishing the means of transportation through itself for the varieties of wood which are brought from everywhere.

263. In speaking of the outlet of the river into the sea I am impelled to mention the harbor. When he saw that this did not rank among those to which it rightfully belonged, the ruler was troubled and changed its form, and there was cut out in Seleucia, but for the benefit of our city, a harbor hewn from the rock at a cost of as much gold as the Pactolus did not treasure up for Croesus. 264. Wherefore all ships put to sea from all parts of the world, carrying goods from everywhere, from Libya, from Europe, from Asia, from the islands and the coasts, and the best of what is best everywhere is brought here, since the quickness of selling draws hither the wits of merchants, and because of this we enjoy the fruits of the whole earth. Among harbors, this has furled the most of the sails that are spread over the seas.

265. Is it then surprising that we, who inhabit such a country and enjoy such a trading place, who have as an ally the lake, and have the highway of the river as a helper, is it surprising that we adorn the city as though for a festal assembly? 266. Where else, indeed, is there a holiday for as many of the whole population as there is here for so many of the people all of the time? Who, seeing the city for the first time, would not think he had come to a festival? Who is so downcast by nature that our city would not turn his soul

to gladness? Where else is there such a great stream of pleasures? What occasion for enjoyment is there that we do not have? Have we not mildness of the air, pleasure of the baths, brilliance of trade? . . . steadily grants? Have we not a spring glistening with flowers, and a summer flashing like lightning with the colors of the fruit trees, making the town a meadow with their scents? Is it not sweeter to walk among the goods offered for sale than to go through the midst of gardens, and is it not pleasanter to meet in the market squares than to pass one's time at home? Is not the very throng which flows through the city sufficient for the pleasure of a spectacle? Among us is not Homer's praise of Sleep refuted as excessive? 267. Here he is not "lord of men," neither does he draw men to himself against their will, or lull them to rest by force, but we alone of all people have shaken off his tyranny over our eyelids, and to the torch of the sun there succeeded other torches which surpass the festival of the lamps in Egypt, and among us night differs from day only in the kind of the light. Night is the same as day for the handicrafts, and some work vigorously while others laugh gently and give themselves up to song. The night is shared indeed by Hephaestus and Aphrodite, for some work at the forge and others dance; but in other cities Endymion is more honored.

268. To what kinds of men does not the city bring profit? Is there not here an easy way to wealth for those who seek it, and to fame for those who possess learning, and to the acquisition of learning for those who desire it? Is it not good for earnest work and at the same time designed for pleasure? Have we not chariot races free from factional strife? Are there not the delights of the stage? Are not such pleasures here the match of cares? Has not the solemn festival of the Eleans come over to us and have we not excelled the founders of the Olympic games by the honor which we show to Zeus? 269. It has come to pass, indeed, that an emperor presented this festival, and putting off his own robe wore the Olympic robe, while another emperor appeared as *hellanodikes* and wore the crown of laurel; the two both honored the rites and were themselves honored by them. If their festival brings some importance to the Eleans, who in other respects do not stand in the first rank among peoples, what then shall we think of our festival when, along with our other good fortune, we are supreme also in the magnificence of the Olympics?

270. What city can we say is worthy to be compared with this? More fortunate than the oldest, it is superior to some in size, surpasses others in the nobility of its lineage, and others in its all-producing territory. By one it may be excelled in walls, but it is greater than this in the abundance of its water and in the mildness of its winter, in the refinement of its inhabitants and in its pursuit of learning; and it is more fair than that city which is even larger, because of that fairest thing, Hellenic education and literature. 271. Finally you will find small cities, and some even among large ones, which are not in the favor of Aphrodite. Here the goddess mother of Eros has poured down because of the size of the city, and if you leave this city and go elsewhere, you will remember this one, and if you come here from another, you will forget what has gone before. Wherefore it is right to forgive those who under the spell of the charms which exist in the city disdain their parents and their homes, for they have seen that this city is like no other, and they know that they will come to nothing else like it.

272. My debt to my native city has been discharged, a payment not inferior to my power, but far below what I would wish to make it. For the future I might say with confidence that some may perhaps surpass this discourse of one of its citizens, but no one will ever make one that will be worthy of the city.

## COMMENTARY

The numbers refer to the sections of the text. Quotations from the translation are italicized.

1. *My native city:* on this phrase see Hugi's note *ad loc.* (p. 75), also J. E. B. Mayor, *Journal of Philology* **15**: 174 ff., 1886. Libanius uses the same term in the last sentence of the oration (§ 272), thus closing on the note with which he opened his panegyric.

9. A *choregia* was the production by a private person of a chorus at a musical and dramatic festival. A liturgy was a similar function compulsorily conferred on a rich citizen.

13. *Of a city:* i.e. of a city and its territory.

14. Compare the description of the ideal city in Plato, *Laws*, 745*b*, "In the next place, the lawgiver must first plant his city as nearly as possible in the centre of the country, choosing a spot which has all the other conveniences also which a city requires . . ." (translation of R. G. Bury in the Loeb Classical Library).

19. On the agricultural products of Syria, see F. M. Heichelheim, Roman Syria, in *An economic survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. by Tenney Frank, **4**: 127 ff., (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1938). Antioch was famous for its wine (*ibid.*, 138–140).

24. In spite of what Libanius says here, a local drought at the beginning of the winter of 361/62 caused the failure of the grain crops which should have been harvested in May and June of 362, and a severe famine resulted; see G. Downey, The economic crisis at Antioch under Julian the Apostate, *Studies in Roman economic and social history in honor of Allan Chester Johnson*, 312–321, Princeton University Press, 1951.

29. On the climate of northern Syria, see C. Combier, La climatologie de la Syrie et du Liban, *Rev. de géographie physique et de géologie dynamique* **6**: 319–346, 1933.

31. Normally, no rain falls in northern Syria between April and November, while the winter itself is a rainy season. In modern times, grain is planted in Syria as soon as the November rains have fallen and the harvest takes place in May and June. See the study of Combier cited in the preceding note.

41. Libanius refers to Seleucia Pieria, the seaport of Antioch, at the mouth of the Orontes River.

43. On the ancient writers on the history of Antioch, see Christ-Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, ed. 6, **2** (2): 1038–1039, Munich, C. H. Beck, 1924.

44. *Both continents:* Europe and Asia. The local legends which Libanius proceeds to recount were doubtless invented in the course of time to explain the origin of the city and to give dignity to its ancient history. On Libanius' treatment of the legend of Io, see Hugi's note, pp. 111–113, and A. B. Cook, *Zeus* 1: 236–237, Cambridge University Press, 1914.

56. Herakleia (or Herakleis) was another name for the suburb Daphne, described below, §§ 236 ff.

57–58. *Cf.* §§ 92, 163–164. On these praises of the origins of the city, and their literary significance, see A. D. Nock, The praises of Antioch, *Jour. Egyptian Archaeology* **40**: 76–82, 1954.

59. Cambyses' campaign against Egypt took place in 525 B.C. Semiramis was born in 844 and died in 782 B.C. After the death of her husband Samsiadad V (824–810 B.C.) she acted as regent (810–806 B.C.) for her son; see Th. Lenschau, Semiramis, *R.E.*, Suppl. **7**: 1204 ff. In Libanius' time, Meroe was a suburb of Antioch.

64. "Established" is here taken to refer to the foundation of a temple rather than to the erection of a statue, as Hugi understands it. *Cf.* Libanius' use of the term in §§ 76, 88.

72. *Battle at Issus:* autumn 333 B.C. The site of Antioch lay on the route south along the coast of Syria which Alexander followed after Issus. This passage is the only preserved evidence that Alexander visited the site of Antioch.

73. *His mother's name:* Olympias; see § 250.

76. The citadel mentioned was on the top of Mount Silpius, above the site later occupied by the city.

85 ff. The traditional version of the foundation of Antioch is in some details modeled on the tradition of the founding of Alexandria; see A. Ausfeld, Zur Topographie von Alexandria und Pseudokallisthenes I, 31–33, *Rheinisches Museum* **55**: 348–384, 1900 and A. Ippel, Ein Sarapisrelief in Hildesheim, *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 8–9, 1921. On Zeus and Apollo as the protectors of the Seleucids, see M. Rostovtzeff, *Progonoi*, *Jour. Hellenic Studies* **55**: 56–66, 1935; *idem*, Le Gad de Doura et Séleucus Nicator, *Mél. syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud*, 281–295, Paris, Geuthner, 1939. Antigonia, no trace of which remains today, was located on the Orontes, seven or eight miles upstream from Antioch, in a secure triangle of land formed by the Lake of Antioch, the Orontes, and the stream which flowed from the lake into the river. *Cf.* § 92.

90. The agora of the original settlement of Seleucus Nicator lay along the bank of the Orontes River, which is the market area of modern Antioch.

92. On Antigonia, see § 85.

101. On the cities founded or refounded by Seleucus, see V. Tscherikower, Die hellenistische Städtegründungen, *Philologus*, Suppl. **9**: pt. 1, 1927.

105. Seleucus died in 281/80 B.C.

108. The kings are Antiochus I Soter, 281-80–261 B.C. and Antiochus II Theos, 261–246 B.C.

111–113. On this legend see S. Reinach, *Cultes, mythes et religions*, ed. 2, **2**: 354, n. 1, Paris, E. Leroux, 1908–1912. This passage has been taken to refer to the bringing to Antioch from Paphos of a statue of Apollo seated on the omphalos. There is, however, no real justification for thinking that it is to such a statue that Libanius refers; see L. Lacroix, Copies de statues sur les monnaies des Séleucides, *Bull. de correspondance hellénique* **73**: 169–170, 1949.

114. *The ruler who followed:* Seleucus II Callinicus, 246–226 B.C.

115. On this motif, see the study of A. D. Nock cited above, commentary on §§ 57–58.

116. The state of Zeus mentioned here may be that which was sent from Antioch to Rome while M. Calpurnius Bibulus was governor of Syria (51–50 B.C.): on the episode see Malalas, p. 212.7–8 Bonn ed., and Benzinger, Byblos, *R.E.* **3**: 1100.

119. *What needs to be mentioned?* i.e. what are the important things which need to be included in an account such as the present one? Antiochus III, the Great, reigned from 223 to 187 B.C. On the growth and development of the city in the Seleucid period, see G. Downey, Strabo on Antioch, *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* **72**: 85–95, 1941.

122. Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 175-164 B.C.

123. *Plundering with impunity* . . .. "To plunder the Mysians" was a proverbial expression because of the traditional feebleness and effeminacy of this folk; examples are cited by Hugi in his note *ad loc.* (p. 158).

*The mountain of the same name:* The Taurus ("bull").

125. On the aqueducts which supplied water to Antioch, see D. N. Wilber, The Plateau of Daphne: the springs and the water system leading to Antioch, *Antioch* **2**: 49–56; P. Bazantay, Un petit pays Alaouite: Le plateau de Daphne, *Haut-Commissariat de la Rép. Française en Syrie et au Liban, Bull. de l'enseignement* **11**: 335–366, 1933–1934; G. Downey, The water supply of Antioch on the Orontes in antiquity, *Annales archéologiques de Syrie* **2**: 171–187, 1951.

126. Antiochus I (281/80–261 B.C.), Seleucus III (226–223 B.C.), and Demetrius I (162–150 B.C.) were all surnamed Soter. Presumably Libanius refers to Antiochus I, the only one of the three whom he has mentioned (§ 108). Antiochus II Theos (261–246 B.C.) has already been mentioned (§§ 108–109). Seleucus II (246–226 B.C.), mentioned in § 114, was surnamed Callinicus. Antiochus III, the Great (223–187 B.C.), has been mentioned in § 119. Seleucus IV (187/86–176/75 B.C.), mentioned only here in this oration, was surnamed Philopator. Antiochus IV (175–164 B.C.), mentioned in § 122, and Antiochus XI (92 B.C.) were surnamed Epiphanes.

128. *Proved themselves superior to their sex:* overcome the supposed handicaps traditionally attributed to their sex.

129. *A golden chain: cf. Iliad,* VIII, 19. On the way in which the Romans gained control, see G. Downey, The occupation of Syria by the Romans, *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* **82**: 149–163, 1951.

134. Normally, men who were bearing a liturgy for the first time would discharge their obligations in a more lavish manner than men who had previously borne liturgies and were now anxious to husband their resources.

146. *The good-will:* of the emperor.

158. The Persians under Shapur I captured Antioch in the middle of the third century; the date is not certain.

*Usurper from Seleucia:* this was a tribune named Eugenius who in A.D. 303 or 304 led the uprising which Libanius describes. On the episode, see further G. R. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanius,* 2–4, Berlin, 1868, and O. Seeck, Eugenius, no. 1, *R.E.* **6**: 986.

159. "The purple robe which was draped about the statue" was the robe with which an imperial statue would be clad.

162. *At Plataea: cf.* Thucydides, II, 4, 2.

163. *The Athenians:* see §§ 58, 92.

164. *As Homer says: Iliad,* IV, 405.

164–167. On the praise of the composition of the population, see the study of A. D. Nock cited in the note on §§ 57–58.

168. *Cf.* Herodotus, V, 65; Pausanias, II, 18, 9.

171. *Cf.* Thucydides, II, 14 and 52.

174. On the expulsion of foreigners from Rome in times of shortage of food, see J.-R. Palanque, Famines à Rome à la fin du IV^e^ siècle, *Rev. études anciennes* **33**: 346–356, 1931.

175. *The son of Agamemnon:* Orestes; for the story of his visit to Antioch, see Malalas, p. 142 Bonn ed.

177. *This last Persian war:* the hostilities which lasted from 339 to 350. On the importance of Antioch as a headquarters and assembly area during these campaigns, see A. Piganiol, *L'Empire chrétien,* 325–395, 75–77, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1947; also G. Downey, *A study of the Comites Orientis and the Consulares Syriae,* 10–11, Diss., Princeton, 1939.

179. *The emperor:* Constantius.

184. For an excellent study of the purposes and methods of education at this time, see J. W. H. Walden, *The universities of Ancient Greece,* New York, Scribner, 1909. Walden includes an account of Libanius' career, both as student and as teacher, and provides translations of a number of passages in Libanius' works which illustrate the conduct of his school at Antioch.

196. *Beginning from the east . . . .* Libanius consistently speaks of the orientation of the city, on its long axis, as east-west, and of the streets as running east-west and north-south (*cf.* §§ 198, 233, 250). Actually the main street ran from northeast to southwest. The eastern end of the city is evidently adopted as the point of departure in the description because the description of Daphne (§§ 236A–242) is intended to form a climax. With the description of the city which follows, the reader should compare the topographical border of the Yakto mosaic (see introduction, p. 654).

198. "North" and "south" here are really northwest and southeast; see note on § 196. *Cf.* the description of the mountain in and around Antioch in § 22, with Förster's note on the text of this passage in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius, p. xxxii, and Hugi's note on pp. 87–89.

201. On the history of the colonnaded streets of the city, see G. Downey, Imperial Building Records in Malalas, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* **38**: 300–311, 1938.

202. *Facing in all directions:* literally, "turned from all sides." *Turning every eye: cf.* § 236A. On nymphaea see O. Reuther, Nymphaeum, *R.E.* **17**: 1517–1524; A. R. A. van Aken, Some aspects of Nymphaea in Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia, *Mnemosyne,* ser. 4, **4**: 272–284, 1951.

203. On the "old city" and the "new city," see G. Downey, Strabo on Antioch, *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* **72**: 85–93, 1941.

205. The plan of the palace on the island at Antioch, which developed from the Roman fortified camp, is typical of other imperial places of the period, of which Diocletian's at Salona is the best known example. Constantinine's palace at Constantinople followed the same plan (C. Du Cange, *Constantinopolis Christiana* **1**: 113, Paris, 1680). The palace at Antioch was built by Diocletian on foundations laid by Gallienus (Malalas, p. 306.21–22 Bonn ed.). The island at Antioch would accommodate a palace of approximately the same size as Diocletian's at Salona (approximately 180×215 metres). Because of the importance of the hippodrome in the imperial ceremonial, the palaces at Antioch and Constantinople had hippodromes adjoining them. For further details, see G. Downey, The palace of Diocletian at Antioch, *Annales archéologiques de Syrie* **3**: 106–116, 1953.

206. *Which we have called an omphalos:* The traditional reading, "which has received also the omphalos" (i.e. possesses the omphalos in addition to having the palace joined to it) implies that the island actually contained an omphalos, but this may be thought to conflict with the statement in § 204 that the stoas proceeded from the center of the island "as from an omphalos." It thus may seem preferable to adopt, in the present passage, one of Reiske's conjectures (*Animadversiones*). The phrase "which we have [previously] called an omphalos" evidently refers to the earlier use of the word, in § 204, and does not necessarily imply that the people of Antioch were accustomed to call the square "the omphalos." Förster's suggested emendation in § 206 is unsuitable because the sense it would give, "for the place joins the middle, which the island has received as an omphalos," is unnecessary and seems inappropriate to the context.

207. *Halls:* Libanius probably uses *andron* in the classical Greek sense of a hall or banquet hall, rather than in the Roman sense of a passage (*cf.* Vitruvius, VI, 7, 5); compare his use of the word in the description of Daphne (§ 236A) and in *Epistl.* 1266=**10**: 452.1–2, and 114=**10**: 115.4. On the meaning of the word, see J. Mattern, *Villes mortes de Haute Syrie,* ed. 2, 101, n. 1, Beyrouth, Imprimerie catholique, 1944. *I believe that if this palace . . . .* On the sentence structure, see Förster's note on this passage in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius, p. xxxviii.

208. *Joining the second to the older:* On the construction, see Förster's note, *loc. cit.* (note on § 207).

210. *Recedes into the background . . . .* On the interpretation, see Förster, *loc. cit.*, p. xxxix (note on § 207). *Cf.* Libanius' comparisons with music and sculpture in § 132, and with painting in § 197.

211. *And if again . . . .* Something has been lost from the text, but the meaning is clear, for we have only to understand or supply some word for "adding" or "joining."

218. On the hippodrome, one of the finest in the Roman Empire, which is still partly preserved, see the description by the excavator, W. A. Campbell, in *Antioch* 1: 34–41. The theatre at Antioch has not been excavated.

219. Literally, "Who, in counting over (examining in detail) the different kinds of *theatra*, would find some made for the contests of athletes, others for [the contests of] men against wild beasts, all in the middle of the city and not forcing one to experience discomfort before pleasures because of the length of the journey to them?" In other cities one would not find separate *theatra*, such as Antioch has, for athletic contests and fights between men and wild animals, but both kinds of contests would be held in the same buildings, i.e., "Who, enumerating the different kinds of *theatra* which are found elsewhere, would find such *theatra* as we have, some made for the contests of athletes . . . ." In addition to this, one would have to make a journey of at least some length in order to reach the *theatra* elsewhere, while in Antioch they are all in the middle of the city. The statements are of course not to be taken literally; in particular, the contrast in the latter part of the sentence is simply between the fact that in Antioch the *theatra* are all in the city itself, while in other cities they might be in the suburbs. Libanius evidently does not mean to take into account the Olympic stadium in Daphne. *Theatron*, which is frequently applied to any building used for the presentation of spectacles or entertainments, is used by Libanius and other writers in the plural to designate generally two or more such buildings, or all such buildings in general, either including or omitting the scenic theatre. In the present passage the word must be used of different buildings, since athletic contests were held in the Plethron and the Xystos. Libanius, in speaking of the *theatra* here, refers to (1) the Xystos built by Commodus (Malalas, p. 283.5–8, Bonn ed.), (2) the Plethron, in which were held the trials of the athletes who came for the Olympic games (*cf.* Liban., *Or.* **10**, *On the Plethron*), and (3) the scenic theatre, in which shows of animals were held on at least one occasion (Liban., *Epist.*, 1380 = **11**, 366).

220. Evagrius (VI, 8) also mentions baths at Antioch designed especially for use in the summer or in the winter. Such establishments seem to have been fairly common, perhaps especially in the East; see *Amer. Journ. Archaeology* **41**: 200, n. 3, 1937, and *Antioch* **2**: 208, n. 13; 211, n. 25.

221. For the interpretation, see Förster's remarks in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius, p. xxxix.

222. Compare the references to the breezes at Antioch in Liban., *Orat.*, XIX, 5 and 53. In §§ 222–226 Libanius seems to be alluding to the doctrine that it was necessary, for hygienic purposes, to orient streets with reference to the position of the sun and to the local prevailing winds; on this doctrine see Fabricius, Städtebau (der Griechen), *R.E.* **3A**: 1999–2000, and H. Wiegand and H. Schrader, *Priene*, 46–47, Berlin, G. Reimer, 1904. Libanius' meaning appears to be that in this respect Antioch is superior to other cities in that the nature of the local winds, which automatically visited every part of the city, made it unnecessary to depend upon orientation in order to receive the benefits which the winds brought.

224. *One beauty:* the breeze.

225. *Into the mansions of the rich* . . . . Reiske would read "into the three-storied mansions of the rich," but since the traditional text gives a satisfactory sense there seems no need to change it. Theophanes (A.M. 6018, p. 172.9 ed De Boor) mentions five-storied houses at Antioch in the sixth century.

*Equal rights:* On the text, see Förster's note in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius, p. xxxix.

226. *The bedding arches* . . . . A reference to the eastern habit of sleeping out of doors, especially on roofs. Libanius once when ill lay "on the roof over the columns" of his house, in a position in which he could be seen from the street (*Or.*, LIV, 34). A stoa ran before his house, which seems to have been on or near one of the main thoroughfares (*Epist.*, 1482 = **11**: 484.1–2).

228. *Three occasions:* On the interpretation of the passage see Förster in *Album gratulatorium in honorem H. van Herwerdeni*, 46, Utrecht, Kemink, 1902; H. van Herwerden in *Rheinisches Museum* **59**: 345, 1904, and Förster in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius (1906), pp. xxxix f. The three disasters from which the city suffered were evidently, as Förster believed, earthquakes. The numerous earthquakes which occurred at Antioch were divided, in local tradition, into two classes, of major and minor disasters, the former being given traditional numbers in series. Thus Malalas (p. 243.12 Bonn ed.) calls the earthquake under Caligula the second earthquake after the end of the Seleucid rule in Syria, and that under Trajan (p. 275.4) the third. Which was counted as the first in this series is difficult to determine because of a chronological confusion in Malalas (see G. Downey, Seleucid Chronology in Malalas, *Amer. Journ. Archaeology* **42**: 119, n. 2, 1938). Unless one of the disasters which occurred under the Seleucids was considered to be of greater magnitude, Libanius apparently refers here to the first three of the earthquakes which were reckoned "after the end of the Seleucid rule." This is suggested particularly by the fact that the fourth earthquake in Malalas' numbered series is that which occurred in A.D. 457 or 458 (Mal., p. 369.6), and also by the circumstance that there is evidence (in Malalas himself and other sources) for other earthquakes at Antioch before the time of Libanius to which Malalas does not assign numbers (see Downey, *op. cit.*, 107, n. 1).

230. If the surroundings of Antioch belonged to another city, they would be considered wonderful in themselves; but with Antioch such a wonderful city as it is, they are overshadowed, so that one would be inclined to say that they ought to be better than they are.

231. *Collections of people:* literally, "inns." The suburbs around Antioch are not merely scattered settlements unrelated to the city or to each other, like inns containing people of all kinds brought together by chance, but they form an integral part of the city and belong to it. The interpretation of E. S. Bouchier, *A short history of Antioch*, 16, Oxford, Blackwell, 1921, misses the point of the comparison with the tribes of the city: "The houses for receiving strangers which clustered round the gates were so richly equipped and provided with such fine baths that the name 'inn' seemed almost a degradation." On the tribes *cf.* § 245. *What is now divided into three:* Förster points out, Antiochia am Orontes, *Jahrb. K. deutschen Archäol. Inst.* **12**: 126, 1897, that the reference is to three groups of suburbs, one across the river from the city and two others at either end of the city. There were no suburbs on the fourth side, which is occupied by the mountain.

232. *The district in front of the palace: cf.* Procopius, *Buildings*, 1, 10, 11.

233. *Are of the same form:* i.e. the same surpassing form.

*Excels all possible appreciation:* Van Herwerden, *Rheinisches Museum* **59**: 345, 1904, compares Sophocles, *Oed. Col.*, 1225, where the phrase means "excels the whole account," i.e. "the whole range of possible appreciation" (Jebb *ad loc.*). *Cf.* above, § 207.

*The only thing that is worthy:* The translation represents *monon*, which Förster suggests ("the only thing"), instead of *mona*, which he prints. *Herakleis:* another name for Daphne; *cf.* § 56 above.

234. *Both sides of the road:* The land near the river, on the right of the road as one went to Daphne, Libanius elsewhere (*Or.*, XXXI, 20) calls "the best land of the city and the most productive of wine."

235. *The god himself:* Apollo.

236. Two successive §§ are numbered 236 in Förster's edition; the second is here numbered 236A.

236A. *The Olympic stadium:* This appears in the Yakto mosaic (see above, p. 654), *Antioch* **1**: 131, fig. 11. On the Olympic games, see the study of Downey cited above, Introduction, note 4.

*Banqueting-halls: cf.* note on § 207.

238. The translation represents Van Herwerden's emendation, *loc. cit.* (above, note on § 233), accepted by Förster in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius, p. xl.

239. The meaning is that Daphne is actually a city, but that because of its proximity to Antioch it was thought of only as a suburb; hence the "city" mentioned here is Daphne itself. Libanius has already (§§ 230–232) expressed much the same thought with regard to the other suburbs of Antioch. For the attitude of Libanius toward the Romans, see G. R. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanius*, 12–14, Berlin, 1868; Förster and Münscher, Libanios, *R.E.* **12**: 2535; and G. Schnayder, De infenso alienigenarum in Romanos animo, *Eos* **30**: 147–149, 1927; *cf.* also the references to Rome below, § 270.

240. On the springs of Daphne see the studies of Wilber and Bazantay cited above, note on § 125.

241. *The three goddesses:* A mosaic showing the Judgment of Paris (now in the Louvre) was found at Antioch in 1932: *Antioch* **1**: 44, fig. 3, and Doro Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*, 16–21, with plate Ib, Princeton University Press, 1947.

242. *The temple:* the context indicates that this is the Temple of Apollo.

243. On the aqueducts see the studies of Wilber and Bazantay cited above, note on § 125.

245. *All the tribes: cf.* § 231. In the time of Theodosius I there were eighteen *phylai* in Antioch (Liban., *Or.*, XIX, 62). The meaning of this somewhat elliptical sentence is not entirely clear. An alternative reading would be: "Wherefore all the tribes of the city pride themselves upon the baths built for them by private individuals—baths which are a greater source of pride than the very names of the tribes."

248. *The bottom will be covered:* The translation follows the reading adopted by Förster in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius, p. xl.

250. *The spring of Alexander:* called Olympias; see above, § 73.

251. The advantage lies with each one of us, in the claims which he bases upon the part of the city in which he lives, on the tribe to which he belongs, etc.

254. Booths set up in colonnades are mentioned in the chronicle of Joshua the Stylite, p. 19–20 transl. Wright, and in the building laws of Zeno (*Cod. Just.*, VIII, 10, 12, 6) and of Justinian (*ibid.*, X, 30, 4, 11); *cf.* Liban., *Or.*, XXII, 37; XXVI, 20, and Chrysostom, *Hom. ad pop. Antioch.*, XXI, 4 = Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* **49**: 220. See also R. A. Pack, *Studies in Libanius and Antiochene Society under Theodosius*, 100–101, Diss., Michigan, 1935.

*Like Odysseus to the wild fig-tree: Odyssey*, XII, 103 ff.

256. *The table of the sun:* Herodotus, III, 17–18.

258. An apt commentary on this passage is provided by the large number of mosaics found at Antioch in which fish of all kinds are shown; see Doro Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*, 38–39, 88, 117–118, 185–186, 190–191, 222, 323–326, 349, 596–603, Princeton University Press, 1947. Thirty-nine species have been identified in one floor.

262. Pindar, *Olymp.*, V, 13, translation of Sandys in the Loeb Classical Library.

263. On the harbor at Seleucia, see E. Honigmann, Seleukeia (Pieria), *R.E.* **2A**: 1190–1192.

266. . . . *steadily grants?* Reiske detected a lacuna, although there is no indication of one in the manuscripts. He proposed, to fill it, "have we not a winter which steadily grants us sunshine?"

*Through the midst of gardens: scil.* among other peoples or in other cities.

*Than to pass one's life at home:* The sense seems to require that we understand "as people do in other places."

267. *To the torch of the sun* . . . . On street-lighting at Antioch, see Pack, *loc. cit.* (above, note on § 254).

*Night . . . is the same for the handicrafts:* The translation follows the explanation adopted by Förster in the introduction to the third volume of his edition of Libanius, p. xxxx–xli.

268. *Olympic games:* See above, § 236A and note.

269. The rulers mentioned may be Diocletian and Maximian. Malalas (pp. 310–311 Bonn ed.) states that Diocletian once presided at the Olympic games of Antioch in the role of Alytarch, and at their completion announced his abdication. This account is evidently a combination of a misunderstood notice of the abdication with a record of the emperor's having acted as Alytarch; see A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Die röm. Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas*, 405, 422, 438–441, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1931. In a passage closely following this (pp. 311-312) Malalas says that Maximian once acted as Alytarch and like Diocletian abdicated at the close of the festival. In his note on the present passage Förster cites Polybius, XXXI, 3, 4 (quoted by Athenaeus, V, 194c ff.), but this is a description of the games celebrated at Daphne by Antiochus Epiphanes, which were not Olympic games.

*The rites: cf.* Libanius' description of the contests held in the Plethron, *Orat.*, X, 4.

270. *By one it may be excelled* . . . . The allusions are to Constantinople and Rome; *cf.* Förster, Antiochia am Orontes, *Jahrb. kaiserlichen deutschen Archäol. Inst.* **12**: 144, with n. 189, 1897.

272. *My native city:* an allusion to the opening sentence of the oration.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### EDITIONS

MOREL, FÉDÉRIC. 1606, 1627. *Libanii Sophistae opera*, 2 v. Paris.

REISKE, JOH. JAC. 1784. *Libanii Sophistae orationes et declamationes*, Quarto, Vol. 1 (all published). Altenburg.

——. 1791–1797. *Libanii Sophistae orationes et declamationes.* Octavo. 4 v. Altenburg.

FÖRSTER, RICHARD. 1903–1927. *Libanii opera.* 12 v. Leipzig, Teubner.

HUGI, LEO. 1919. *Der Antiochikos des Libanius, eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert.* Diss., Freiburg-i.-d.-Schweiz. Contains only §§ 1–131.

CRITICISM AND COMMENTARY

ASMUS, RUDOLF. 1904. Review of vol. 1 of Förster's edition, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* **21**: 629–633.

BIELSKI, JOH. 1914. *De aetatis Demosthenicae studiis Libanianis.* Diss., Breslau.

COBET, C. G. 1861–1876. Textual criticism of *Or.* **11**: 196–272, in: *Mnemosyne* **10**: 197–198, 1861; *ibid.*, N.S. **2**: 404, 1874; *ibid.*, N.S. **5**: 109–111, 1877; *Collectanea critica*, 105–107, Leyden, 1878; also general palaeographic and grammatical notes on Libanius in *Miscellanea critica*, 138–168, Leyden, 1876.

CRÖNERT, WILHELM. 1904. Review of vol. 1 of Förster's edition, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 730–739, no. 9.

GASDA, AUGUST. 1870. Textual criticism of *Or.* 196–272, in: *Kritische Beiträge zu Libanios.* Progr., Lauban.

KRUSE, BERNHARD GR. 1915. *De Libanio Demosthenis imitatore.* Diss., Breslau.

MIDDLETON, G. 1919, 1928. *Studies in the orations of Libanius, Parts 1 and 2: Imitations of classical writers in Libanius's orations.* Aberdeen, University Press.

REISKE, JOH. JAC. 1766. Notes on *Or.* **11**, in: *Animadversiones ad Graecos auctores* **5**: 205–225, Leipzig.

RICHTSTEIG, EBERHARD. 1919. *Libanius qua ratione Platonis operibus usus sit.* Diss., Breslau.

ROTHER, CARL. 1915. *De Libanii arte rhetorica quaestiones selectae.* Diss., Breslau.

ROTHER, CARL WILHELM. 1912. *De Choricii studiis Libanianis.* Diss., Breslau.

SCHENKL, HEINRICH. 1904. Review of vol. 1 of Förster's edition, *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* **24**: 1441–1450.

SCHMID, WILHELM. 1904. Review of vol. 1, fasc. 2, of Förster's edition, *Literarisches Zentralblatt* **55**: 232–233.

SCHWABE, MAX. 1918. *Analecta Libaniana.* Diss., Berlin.

VAN HERWERDEN, H. 1904. Adnotationes ad Libanii orationum editionem Foersterianum, *Rheinisches Museum* **59**: 329–345.

WERNER, WILHELM. 1910. *De Libanii studiis Herodoteis.* Diss., Breslau.

# THE PRESIDENCY AND CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP: SOME NOTES ON OUR CHANGING CONSTITUTION

DAVID B. TRUMAN

Professor of Government, Columbia University

(*Read November 13, 1958*)

ALTHOUGH students of politics have long since abandoned the view that the American Constitution is completely a written instrument and although they no longer think of it as inherently rigid, almost of necessity their recognition of a change in constitutional practice is likely to lag behind the fact. The probability of such lag may be especially great where new practices have not displaced older ones but rather have been gradually superimposed upon them and where the complexities of the affected institution obscure emerging trends. Some preliminary explorations, summarily reported here, strongly suggest the development in this century of significant changes in the pattern of party leadership in the Congress, associated with alterations in the relations between President and Congress.[1]

No great effort is necessary to demonstrate that the most fundamental constitutional fact of our times is the emergence of the modern Presidency. As Woodrow Wilson saw with remarkable acuity in 1900, the appearance of the United States on the international scene as a major power in its own right could only foreshadow a sharp increase in the relative importance of the President in the federal system.[2] Moreover, influences from the realm of foreign policy have been very nearly matched in a somewhat shorter span of time by the growth of a new, semi-managed political economy whose forms and limits are much in dispute but the core of whose existence is accepted in word and action by all but a small minority.

Although the changes in constitutional practice immediately associated with the Presidency are obvious enough to layman and student alike, it is probably safe to say that most specialists have seen no alterations of consequence in the functioning of the Congress. Their assumptions do not depart much from the brilliant portrait drawn by Wilson in 1885, in which the critical focus was upon the bipartisan standing committees, which he pictured as so numerous and so successful in protecting their jurisdictions that they, and especially their chairmen, exercised the real legislative power. Most recent accounts of the Congress, even many that are friendly, accept this view in its essentials.[3]

But could it be that the monumental changes in the Presidency have occurred without corresponding developments in the Congress and in the legislative parties? In raising such a question and in answering it, tentatively, in the negative, one need not deny the classic qualities of Wilson's study or even argue that it is now outmoded.

If we look at the essential features of the altered Presidency, we can find at least four that would encourage such a negative answer. First and most fundamental is a shift in the source of initiative for most basic legislation from the Congress toward the civilian and military bureaucracies and those directing them. Second, both as a cause and as a consequence of this shift, attention in and outside the government has been focused to an unprecedented degree upon the President as the principal spokesman for those bureaucracies. Whatever the facts, the sources of policy are regarded as his, and his is the inescapable responsibility for proposing means for meeting whatever ills the country faces. Third, because of this concentration of attention, the political fortunes of most Representatives and

[1] The research of which this report is a by-product was made possible by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The author also gratefully acknowledges the support provided by a fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation and by a Ford Research Professorship from Columbia University. These explorations profited from the able assistance of Mr. James S. Young.

[2] Wilson, Woodrow, *Congressional government*, preface to fifteenth printing, xi, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1900.

[3] Wilson, Woodrow, *Congressional government*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1885. Compare, for example, Acheson, Dean, *A citizen looks at Congress*, New York, Harper, 1957.

Senators in the President's party seem increasingly to depend upon those of the Administration. This is not the legislator's only dependence; he may enjoy unusual strengths or run special risks in his constituency. But in most cases the party label under which he runs depreciates in value if a President with whom that label is also identified is regarded as not having met the expectations of the voters. Finally, along with the growth of political and official responsibilities, the Presidency, especially in the last two decades, has experienced a spectacular expansion of what might be called its *de facto* constituency. Those who are in a position to affect an Administration's policies are no longer concentrated within our borders and are not necessarily numbered among our citizens. They include people and governments throughout the non-Soviet world. The implications of this expansion are many, but among them certainly is the likelihood that no President has the time and strength to give day-to-day leadership to the Congress and to his legislative party, despite their importance to his effectiveness.

The changes one should be led to expect within the Congress in response to these four new dimensions of the Presidency are consistent with Wilson's expectations in 1900, when he noted the possibility that ". . . the new leadership of the Executive . . will have a very far-reaching effect upon our whole method of government." [4] Specifically one could anticipate the emergence of altered forms of leadership, in addition to rather than supplanting those based on the seniority and committee systems, reflecting the legislature's increased dependence upon presidential initiative and, for the members of the President's own party, also reflecting an increased stake in the President's and the Administration's prestige. One would expect that the needs of neither the President nor his fellow-partisans in the Congress could be served without some such development. That is, the success of an Administration, as the late Senator Taft clearly recognized, important both to the President and to his fellow partisans in the Congress, calls for a degree of integrated guidance in the House and Senate that is not likely to emerge from the dispersed power centers in the standing committees and that the President cannot directly supply on a continuous basis.

In the Senate the role most susceptible of evolution into a new leadership form is the Floor Leader, especially in the majority or presidential party. In the House the position of Majority Leader is, of course, accessory to the Speakership, so that the two roles need to be treated as if they were functionally united. The evolutionary potential of these roles lies in their not being tied to a segmental base of influence such as a standing committee and in the ambiguity and imprecision with which the limits of their influence have been conventionally defined, even in the case of the Speaker. In changing political circumstances that invite a more integrated leadership in the legislature, positions such as these are likely points of growth. They are sufficiently formal to be somewhat independent of the personalities occupying them but at the same time they are vaguely enough defined to accommodate gradual, almost imperceptible alteration.

If the expectation of alteration in the congressional leadership pattern is warranted, one would expect to find in the behavior of contemporary occupants of these positions distinctive features traceable to the characteristics of the new Presidency. One would also anticipate that the character of these roles had altered over the past four or five decades. Unfortunately, the history of these positions has never been written, and one is therefore obliged to rely upon scraps of data which at this stage can be drawn together only through the generous use of conjecture.[5]

Nevertheless, one indeed gains from these fragments a fairly solid impression that around the Floor Leader a new system of organization has gradually developed, not displacing the older forms associated with parochial ties to the constituencies or with the standing committees, but in a sense paralleling them. Observers of the congressional scene have been disposed to see it in the alternative terms either of hierarchy or of anarchic feudality. The possibility that the structure of the chambers and the legislative parties is a composite of distinct but interdependent organizational systems, each somewhat specialized, each with its own pattern of leadership, and each corresponding to one of the several roles

[4] Wilson, Woodrow, *Congressional government*, preface to fifteen printing, xiii, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1900.

[5] "The great historical constitutional studies," a recent commentator notes, "have been of the position of the presidency rather than of Congress." Griffith, Ernest F., *Congress: its contemporary role*, 8–9, New York, New York University Press, 1951.

played by national legislators, has no place in such a polar conception. Yet it is consistent both with the developmental expectations suggested here and with impressions drawn from the fragmentary historical data.

The function of Floor Leader is, of course, a very old one, especially in the House, and precedents of long standing exist even for this function being performed by a member who informally represents the President. Most of these precedents, however, occurred in the first three or four decades under the Constitution, before the full establishement of the standing committee system, which quite evidently was regarded by at least some of its creators as a means of guidance in each chamber that would be independent of the executive. In the first decade of this century and apparently for some years before, leadership in the Senate and House, and within their majority parties, was usually in the hands of a group of oligarchs—chairmen of the principal standing committees—one of whom characteristically in the Senate assumed the Floor Leader's role on behalf of the others.[6] Much the same pattern existed in the House despite the somewhat greater degree of hierarchy assumed to exist there.[7]

A basis for party leadership alternative to that provided by procedural control of the major committees began to appear in the period of insurgency in both parties prior to the Wilson Administration. This was implicit in Cannon's appointment of a whip, John W. Dwight, in the Sixtieth Congress (1907–1909), for it indicated not only that the older system needed buttressing but also that a leader who could know and speak for the sentiments of the rank and file could have a type of skill and a base of influence that would distinguish him from the committee chairman. In the years between the anti-Cannon "revolt" in the House and the end of the Wilson Administration, the "progressive" cleavage in both parties and in both chambers necessarily was associated with challenges to the committee-based oligarchy of chairmen, challenges that took the form of a variety of "democratizing" demands, probably more important as symptom than as substance. For present purposes the most significant response to these demands was an increased concern for the attitudes of the rank-and-file member, a concern that required a new concentration of time and energy on the part of the Floor Leader and one that implied the emergence of a new base of power.

Among the Senate Democrats this response apparently was facilitated by a number of factors, perhaps the most important of which was that the "progressives" in 1913 were strong enough to elect one of their number, Senator Kern of Indiana, to the Floor Leadership but were not able to control the committee chairmanships. Thus the policy cleavage was translated into a structural one, and the influence of the Floor Leader depended in large measure on his general following, since that derived from the chairmanships was denied him.

This trend was of course facilitated by Wilson's enlarged conception of the Presidency, by his conscious effort to rely on party as an instrument of governing, and by the coincidence of view between him and the "progressives." However, it was not unambiguous. Wilson was obliged, especially in his second term, with great frequency to deal directly with the committee chairmen, a circumstance that must have tended to blur if not to subvert the position of the new Floor Leadership. In fact, one gains from the press dispatches of these years an impression of considerable variation, if not confusion, in the relations of President and Congress.

With Wilson's encouragement and participation, the Democrats in both chambers resorted to the revived caucus as a means of promoting party effectiveness. In the House, in fact, Underwood's reliance upon this device is one of the principal symptoms of the change in the power base. As Floor Leader he seems to have turned to the caucus and to the floor as major arenas of activity and to have relied very little upon his committee chairmanship. The modification of the Speaker's powers in 1910, moreover, had not reduced that role to a cipher but had placed greater emphasis upon its informal influence, upon the Speaker's following among the Representatives, including, of course, the committee chairmen.[8] The roles of the Speaker and the

[6] Stephenson, N. W., *Nelson W. Aldrich*, 89, New York, Scribner's, 1930. Barry, David S., *Forty years in Washington*, 155, Boston, Little, Brown, 1924.

[7] Chiu, Chang-Wei, *The Speaker of the House of Representatives since 1896*, 71, New York, Columbia University Press, 1928. Stealey, O. O., *Twenty years in the press gallery*, 305–306, New York, 1906 (published by the author).

[8] The post-Cannon atmosphere is suggested by Champ Clark's formula for leadership in the House: "The entire philosophy for success in that able and tumultuous

Floor Leader thus seem to have shifted simultaneously to a new or at least a somewhat altered power base, one whose characteristics reinforced the tendency toward interdependence between the two positions.

Among the Republicans, these changes in the leadership systems came more slowly, especially in the Senate, and for reasons that are not obscure. When the Republicans captured the Senate after 1918, they retained a structure of the older form, with Lodge holding both the Floor Leadership and the key position in the Committee on Foreign Relations. Upon Lodge's death in 1924, however, the position went, not to one of the key committee chairmen, but to Charles Curtis of Kansas, who had a considerable record as a party functionary but held no major chairmanship. Viewed in the context of the other developments noted here, the disinclination of any of the major chairmen to undertake the Floor Leadership indicates, as some contemporary accounts suggest, that it had become a burden, that the tasks of building consensus and of floor guidance had become heavy ones not entirely compatible with the chairmanship of a key committee.[9]

It is in this sense that one may infer that the Floor Leadership had gradually become dissociated from the committee system. The Floor Leader's influence did not, and apparently could not, depend directly on his committee position. Lodge, in fact, was the last Senate Majority Leader in either party who also held the top position on a major committee. Before 1913, moreover, Floor Leaders in the Senate were drawn at least from the membership of the major committees, if not from among their chairmen, while after that year no discernible pattern appears in their committee affiliations. It may also be relevant that in the latter period the Senate seniority of the men chosen as Floor Leaders, an index of their standing in the committee system, has become progressively lower.

In the House the Republican transition was more like that of the Senate Democrats. A bitter caucus struggle followed the successful election of 1918. Accounts differ concerning what went into the settlement of that conflict, but out of it Mondell of Wyoming, the "progressive" candidate, emerged as the choice for Floor Leader. In his hands the position rapidly grew in significance. The different bases of influence were symbolized, however, in the retention of committee chairmanships by senior members of the opposing faction. In addition, the newer features of the Floor Leader's position were in a way symbolized in the 1919 decision, since consistently adhered to by the Republicans, that the Floor Leader should serve on no standing committee. The Democrats have been less drastic in their policies, but since Underwood their Floor Leaders typically have held no committee post or have belonged only to one of the minor bodies. This kind of arrangement is not startling by itself but, along with other consistent adjustments, it reflects change.[10]

The Administration of Franklin Roosevelt not only raised to a new plateau the prestige of the Presidency and the degree of initiative expected from the office but in consequence also reinforced the tendencies in congressional party leadership that have been sketched here for the Wilson period and the years immediately following. The details are too familiar to require repeating, but it may be worth while to note that it was during these years that the regular conferences between the President and the "Big Four" (or "Big Six") of the House and Senate parties became a standard practice. This new institution, of course, had a number of important functional implications, but at minimum it marked a new public prominence accorded to these positions in the legislative party as well as in presidential councils.

Evidence supplementing the fragments of historical data and further confirming the existence of a system of congressional leadership partly supplementary and partly alternative to the committee chairmen has been developed through an exploration of the voting record of a recent con-

assembly is to take things by the smooth handle, to rub the hair the right way of the hide, and to confer freely with members, persuading rather than attempting to drive, yielding in non-essentials." *New York Times*, February 14, 1916.

[9] Haynes, George H., *The Senate of the United States*, 480, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1938. Senator Curtis was the first Republican Floor Leader in at least thirty-five years who at the time of his accession did not hold a major committee chairmanship.

[10] One may detect a similar symptom of change in the listing of the Majority Leader in the *Congressional Directory*, beginning in 1919, as an "Officer of the House." The House Whips were not so listed until 1935. In the Senate, although Gallinger was described as "chairman of the minority" in the *Directory* of 1913, the Floor Leaders and Whips were not regularly listed among the "Officers of the Senate" until 1935. However, they were included on the telephone lists in the *Directory* as early as 1931.

gress, the Eighty-first (1949–1950). The results of this investigation point, first, to the Floor Leader, particularly on the majority side, as a central figure in the party structure and one whose influence is not dependent on the committee chairmen. Although, as Wilson argued, the ranking members of the standing committees showed by their votes that they rarely act in concert, as individuals they were more likely to vote with the Floor Leader, or he with them, when a measure reported by their respective committees was being considered than when other matters were before the House or Senate. This behavior suggests not only the existence of relations between the two types of leaders that were focused on the specialized concerns of each committee but also, and more important, the existence of a pattern of accommodation between them that even extended to committee chairmen normally identified with a dissident faction of the party.

This accommodation could mean that the Floor Leader, though a central figure in the party, had no independent influence and that he acted as no more than an agent for the committee chairmen. In some instances this must have been the case, for, if it is correct to view these as parallel systems of leadership, it would hardly be likely that one could be consistently dominant. Granting this point, the data nevertheless demonstrate that on numerous occasions the Floor Leader rather than the committee chairman was in the prevailing position. That is, when they disagreed on votes dealing with a measure reported by a particular committee, as they sometimes did, especially in the Senate, the majority of the party and even a majority of the party's members on the affected committee more often than not voted with the Floor Leader. There were individual exceptions, enough to make it clear that the pattern was not a simple one, but the evidence is persuasive that the Floor Leader led, or at least represented, a majority within the party that was not at the ready disposal of the committee chairman.

In the second place, the voting data indicate that the Floor Leader's influence, if such it was, did not rest simply upon closer communion with the general run of his party colleagues. The basis for this inference is the evidence that the pattern of accommodation between Floor Leaders and ranking committeemen was not the same in the majority and minority parties. Disagreement was more frequent among the leaders of the minority, and the minority Floor Leaders were less likely in such cases to find themselves in agreement with a majority of their partisans in the chamber or on the affected committee. These differences, of course, may have been fortuitous, and to some extent they must have reflected personal variations in skill and in policy, but they are consistent with the interpretation that the Floor Leader on the majority side was more than merely a spokesman for the party rank and file, that something in the situation of the majority distinguished his role from that of the Minority Leader and produced a greater convergence between his votes and those of his party colleagues.

In the third place, the impression of convergence is reinforced by evidence that in this Congress in both houses the minority party showed a markedly greater fluidity of structure than the majority. That is, the blocs into which the minority divided on a succession of votes were more numerous, smaller, and less cohesive than those among the majority. The source of this fluidity was a tendency for the minority members to shift their intra-party associations on the record votes, not quite from issue to issue, but from one cluster of issues to another. In other words, even though the average cohesion of the minority on a series of votes might be greater than that of the majority, as in fact it was in the House, the basis of this cohesion was a more fluid one, so that the majority displayed a more persistent pattern of cleavage.

These differences between the majority and minority Floor Leaders and between the two parties not only point to something distinctive about the situation of the majority but also suggest that their voting convergence developed around a program of particular consequence to the majority legislative party. A clue to this program factor appears when one examines the votes on which the record indicates a clear presidential preference. These votes in both houses and in both sessions of this Congress consistently separated most members of the majority from most of those in the minority. More important, these Administration support votes were preeminently the ones on which accommodation occurred between the majority Floor Leaders and the several committee chairmen. These presidential preferences, moreover, did not have the same impact upon the minority. They were not associated with the same kind of convergence, even in opposition to the presidential program.

In the Senate, in fact, such accommodation as existed between the Floor Leader and the ranking committeemen was more likely to involve votes on which no presidential preference was evident.

It therefore seems permissible to infer from these data not only that the position of the Floor Leader has a base different from that of the committee chairman and that the influence he exercises is not exclusively dependent upon the committees and their leaders, but also that a Majority Leader of the President's political persuasion finds his position enhanced and his influence increased by the initiatives and the program emerging from the White House.

These fragments of evidence are not conclusive. The factors affecting the behavior of a Senator or Representative and especially of a party leader in the Congress are multiple and complex. Nevertheless, the data so far developed are consistent with the hypothesis that the years of this century have produced within the House and Senate parties a system of leadership different from and, in a sense, alternative to that of the ranking members of the standing committees, a system that reflects the new stature of the Presidency in the governmental scheme. The emergent system is not consistently evident and it is not normally at the command of a President, even when his party is in the majority. The changes in constitutional practice to which it points have not involved many alterations in the distribution of formal authority and are not fully recognized even by the chief participants. Nor are these changes more than very loosely described by characterizations of the President as "chief legislator" or "party leader." His new position, to be sure, has made him as never before the focus for policy initiative, but paradoxically it has denied him the time for a direct and continuous leadership of the Congress. Leadership of a legislature that retains much of its ancient parochialism and in which significant power is still dispersed among committee chairmen designated through the impersonal system of seniority cannot be a part-time job. Such a legislature requires its own leadership, but one that cannot afford to ignore the attitudes of its fellow partisans, whether in the White House or among the congressional rank and file.

The new constitutional practice thus seems to involve a triangular system of interdependence within a partisan context: A Presidency enjoying an enhanced prestige and responsibility for initiative, but needing in the short run an effective intermediary leadership in the Congress in order to maintain the prestige of the White House occupant; a Floor Leadership based primarily upon influence among the rank and file but normally requiring the leverage supplied by close contact with the President in order to maximize that influence; a rank and file of Senators and Representatives whose political fortunes are in varying degrees dependent upon those of the President but requiring an intermediate leadership capable both of representing their views in presidential councils and of performing as an authoritative source of presidential preferences and intentions.

Not all legislative-executive policy-making, even in major matters, follows this system, if only because much of it cannot or need not be contained in partisan channels. The system, moreover, is subject to interruption when the same party is not in power at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue; it is susceptible to mismanagement when any of the major participants misgauges its implicit requirements; and it is subject to alteration under a variety of other conditions. Paralleling and, in a sense, encompassing the older, committee-based system of legislative leadership, however, it seems capable of providing the integrated policy guidance that Wilson sought without unnecessary sacrifice of a useful and perhaps inevitable diversity.

# FISHER AMES, SPOKESMAN FOR NEW ENGLAND FEDERALISM

ELISHA P. DOUGLASS

Department of History, University of North Carolina

## I

BOSTON had always observed the passing of her favorite sons with obsequies commensurate with their status and achievements, but the funeral of Fisher Ames, July 5, 1808, was a particularly impressive one. The procession, which had formed at Christopher Gore's mansion in Bowdoin Square, contained—in Federalist eyes at least—much of the wealth and virtue of the state. In order of march came the Deputy Marshall of Harvard College, the junior and senior classes, the tutors and professors, the Boston clergy, the President of Harvard, pallbearers, relations, the Governor of Massachusetts, the Lieutenant Governor, Members of the Council, and other important officials. While the stately parade of mourners moved slowly out of Back Bay, around the Common, and up Tremont Street to King's Chapel, shops closed along the way, and shipping, much of it locked in the harbor by Mr. Jefferson's embargo, flew colors at half-mast.

The pallbearers, core of the procession, were, suitably enough, the Essex Junto, core of New England Federalism. This was indeed a melancholy day for Harrison Gray Otis, Christopher Gore, George Cabot, Timothy Pickering, and Theophilus Parsons. The burden they bore on their hearts was as heavy as the burden they bore on their shoulders. Their Federalist Party, which had guided the destinies of the nation through the critical period of its infancy, was now fading into oblivion. Narrowly defeated in 1800, contemptuously spurned in 1804, it could now, in 1808, no longer even be assured of the loyalty of its native New England. Every principle of virtue, every interest that lay close to the Federalists' hearts, they felt was being submerged by the irresistible tide of democracy. Legislatures, courts, executives—all were in the hands of their enemies headed by the Machiavelli in the White House—Thomas Jefferson. And bad as things were in the present, the future promised only greater disasters. They were convinced that the infatuated Republicans were steering the country into war with Great Britain, the one nation which still held aloft the torch of freedom by devoting all the power at its command to the struggle against Bonaparte and the evil principles of the French Revolution. New England's voice was lost in the cacophony of war whoops coming from the South and West, and the only reward the Federalists received for their devotion to Right Principles was the draining of their life blood by the embargo. The Essex Junto, as it plodded slowly toward King's Chapel, might well have reflected on the irony of the situation. In 1774, when Parliament had shut up the port of Boston, the southern colonies sprang to the aid of New England even at the cost of war with the mother country. Yet in 1807 Mr. Jefferson had closed all the ports of New England with the approval of a majority of Americans.

But the funeral of Fisher Ames was notice to democratic America that even in disaster the Federalist party would remain true to its faith. Ames, once in the front rank of Federalist politicians but retired and ailing for ten years before his death, represented in his friends' eyes more perfectly than any other individual the spirit of the party. His passing was symbolic of the passing of that party. It was doubly fitting, therefore, that the occasion be as solemn and respectful as possible. As a kind of epitaph, Ames's friends published in the next year a selection of his speeches and writings. If Ames had suffered death, in the eyes of his admirers, he had at least achieved transfiguration.[1]

[1] *The works of Fisher Ames*, Boston, 1809. The funeral of Ames is described in *The Columbian Centinel*, July 6, 9, 1808. The significance of the funeral was recognized by John Adams, now in retirement and bitter over what he considered to be the treachery of his former Federalist friends. "Ames' party made the most of his death by processions, orations, and a mock funeral," he wrote. "And why? To glorify the Tories, to abash the Whigs, and maintain the reputation of banks and speculation." Lipscomb, Andrew A., and Albert E. Bergh, eds., *The writings of Thomas Jefferson* **15**: 69, Washington, Memorial Association, 1903. John Quincy Adams, now an ardent Republican, reacted strongly to the attempt to canonize Ames by posthumous publication. Believing that the editors of his *Works* were trying to makes Ames's name "a passport to corruption," he published a long review of

With due allowance for the oversimplification of popular labels, Fisher Ames might be called the Mr. Federalist of his generation to the same extent that the late Senator Robert A. Taft was the Mr. Republican of a later day. To his many admirers Ames was the perfect embodiment of the American statesman—in public life judicious, energetic, and forceful, in debate logical, clear, and often stirringly eloquent, in private life scrupulously honest, unfailingly moral, unaffectedly pious, and warmly convivial. As one admirer put it, although Ames was considered "a wit, philospher, and handsome man of the world," nevertheless "his private life was stained by no vice and sullied by no meanness."[2] What particularly gave joy to his followers was his devotion to Right Principles of Government, as they conceived them. Lesser men, they felt, might use comparable talents for personal gain, or even worse, for courting the masses. But Ames was no demagogue. He spurned "popularity" and did not hesitate to follow his principles even when these clashed with the infatuations of a deluded people. Chief Judge Parsons of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court was certainly speaking for others beside himself when he wrote, "No man in this community ever won so much public admiration, and, at the same time, the warm affection of so wide a circle of friends."[3] A eulogist on the occasion of the funeral was not necessarily exaggerating when he declaimed "Beyond the glare of Greek or Roman names we loved the purer light of virtuous Ames."[4] Timothy Pickering, seldom swayed by affection for his fellow men, described him as ". . . the immortal Ames, then whom a purer spirit never left the earth."[5] Timothy Dwight, President of Yale and reputed Pope of Connecticut congregationalism, considered Ames one of the most distinguished and eloquent statesmen of the age.[6] Ames's enemies, although bitterly denunciatory of his politics, acknowledged his influence and esteemed his ability. Jefferson, commenting on the election of 1792, had called him "the colossus of the monocrats and paper men."[7] Gallatin asserted that Ames and Marshall were the two superior men in the Federalist Party.[8]

Ames's ability to make friends and conciliate enemies was probably responsible for the relatively small number of personal attacks made upon him. The unfailing good humor and sincere interest in the welfare of his friends, as exhibited in his letters, show a real talent for friendship. "Your most obedient, humble servant," coming at the end of a letter, sounded more like a pledge of intention than a formality. In debate, although Ames sometimes unpityingly dissected the arguments of opponents, he seldom dealt in personalities. Most of his speeches began and ended with graceful gestures of respect for the opposition, regardless of what he might think of its principles and policies.

By both friends and enemies Ames was considered one of the best orators of his day. Never using notes, he would start a speech calmly and informally. But, as he approached the heart of his subject, he would throw back his head, apparently somewhat in the manner of William Jennings Bryan, and increase the pace and emphasis of his delivery to the accompaniment of dramatic tonal effects and sweeping gestures. The climax of his speech was always a major histrionic effort.[9] His material was well organized, and his vocabulary had variety and range, but sometimes, heated with violent emotion, he would sacrifice logic for melodrama. Even such a sympathetic observer as Timothy Dwight felt that Ames sometimes poured it on too thick:

the volume in which he bitterly condemned what he believed to be the "scorn" and "contempt" which Ames showed for his country and his "aversion to republics and republican institutions." The preface to the review is contained in Ford, Worthington C., ed., *The writings of John Quincy Adams* **3**: 305–311, New York, Macmillan, 1917. The complete review is published in the Boston *Patriot*, Apr. 29, May 24, 27, June 3, 7, 10, 1809.

[2] Forney, John W., *Anecdotes of public men*, 108, New York, 1881.

[3] Parsons, Theophilus, *Memoir of Theophilus Parsons*, 115, Boston, 1859. "Give Ames a column in a newspaper," Parsons wrote to a friend, "and he will do more than you and I and all of us can do by talking and writing in a month." *Ibid.*, 114.

[4] Quoted from Morison, Samuel E., Squire Ames and Dr. Ames, *New England Quart.* **1**: 5, 1928. *The Columbian Centinel*, July 6, 1808, contains a typically effusive eulogy. The funeral oration, delivered by Samuel Dexter, was of course in much the same vein. It is printed in the Boston *Gazette*, July 11, 1808.

[5] Hildreth, Richard, *History of the United States* **3**: 103–104, New York, 1852.

[6] Dwight, Timothy, *Travels in New England and New York* **3**: 118–120, London, 1823.

[7] Lipscomb and Bergh, *The writings of Thomas Jefferson* **8**: 440.

[8] Adams, Henry, *The life of Albert Gallatin*, 155–156, New York, 1879.

[9] Thayer, James B., Fisher Ames, in *American Statesmen*, 285–286, New York, 1860; Sullivan, William, *The public men of the revolution . . . in a series of letters*, 57–59, Philadelphia, 1847.

"His imagination was perhaps too brilliant and too rich. It can hardly be said that any of the pictures which it drew were ill-drawn or out of place; yet it might, I think, be truly said, that the gallery was crowded."[10] A fellow townsman of Ames who had little patience with spread eagle oratory—probably his brother Nathaniel—was more blunt. Rising in Dedham meeting one day to reply to a speech by Ames, he observed, "Mr. Moderator, my brother Ames' eloquence reminds me of nothing but the shining of a firefly which gives just light enough to show its own insignificance."[11]

Physically, Ames was as attractive as his personality. About middle height, well proportioned and erect, he had a face which was pleasing if not formally handsome.[12]

Ames's amiable qualities, then, seem to have been acknowledged by most observers, but these observers usually ignored one characteristic of great importance in evaluating his career—emotional instability. Ames was constantly tormented by anxiety. In his mind problems inflated themselves into crises, disappointments into disasters, disillusionment into despair. His world was only a brief hiatus between the error, injustice, and corruption of the past and the catastrophe of the future. Although dissatisfied with conditions as he found them, he always assumed that change would be for the worse. This anxiety was quite possibly the cause of his chronic ill health and his somewhat early death. Diagnosing the ills of the dead is highly speculative business, but in Ames's case the combination of anxiety and physical debilitation would seem to be more than mere coincidence. About 1792, when thirty-four years old, he began to undergo periodic prostration brought on by violent headaches, backaches, and faintness. These attacks increased in frequency and intensity until by his death in 1808 he was practically an invalid. In all probability Ames was a hysteric.[13]

Paradoxically, however, this affliction gave impressiveness to his oratory. Ames's constant conviction that death awaited him the next day enabled him to play a convincing Camille in legislative debate. The impact of his famous speech on the Jay treaty in the House of Representatives, for example, was considerably heightened by the assertion that this would be his last oratorical effort before the grave closed over him. The audience who saw him helped to his feet to begin the speech, sway with weakness at strategic points during the delivery of it, and retire on the arms of friends needed little to be convinced that they had seen a selfless patriot devoting his last gasping breath to the welfare of his country.

Ames's great reputation died with the Federalist Party he so vigorously defended. As Samuel E. Morison has stated, his was the fate of all political thinkers who embrace a political and social theory discredited by later generations.[14] Although quotations from his voluminous writings sprinkle modern treatments of the Federal period, he has not been considered of sufficient importance to merit a full-scale biography.[15] Most modern writers have followed Vernon Parrington in dismissing him as a typical representative of "the tie wig school" of American politics without giving much analysis to his thought or that of "the tie wig school."[16] Adams, Hamilton, and sometimes

[10] Dwight, *Travels* **3**: 118. This comment is all the more interesting in view of the fact that Dwight himself was often subjected to the same sort of criticism.

[11] Thomas, E. S., *Reminiscences of the last 65 years* **1**: 54, Hartford, 1890. Another acquaintance observed that although the sound of Ames's voice was like the strains of sweetest music, "when he had finished, the effect died away upon the ear; the impression was not lasting . . . ." *Ibid.*, 53.

[12] The most complete physical description available is by John T. Kirkland, Ames's friend and biographer, contained in Ames, Seth, ed., *The works of Fisher Ames* **1**: 27, Boston, 1854. The Rev. William Bently, of Salem—a staunch Republican who had known Ames since college days—described him as "small in person, firm in temper, but conciliating in his manners." *The diary of William Bently* **3**: 370, Salem, Essex Institute, 1905.

[13] A description of hysteria is contained in Cattell, Raymond B., *Description and measurement of personality*, 46–48, Yonkers, N. Y., 1946.

[14] Morison, Samuel E., Squire Ames and Dr. Ames, *New England Quart.* **1**: 6, 1928.

[15] There have been several short sketches of Ames, however. Particularly good is the treatment by Morison in *The Dictionary of American Biography* and in "Squire Ames and Dr. Ames." The earliest sketch, by Ames's friend and mentor, John T. Kirkland, President of Harvard, contains most of the readily available biographical information, but the judgments and evaluations are of course those of a confirmed Federalist. The sketch is printed in *The works of Fisher Ames*, Boston, 1809, and in Ames, Seth, ed., *The works of Fisher Ames*, 2 v., Boston, 1854. For other biographical sketches see: Thayer, James B., Ames, in *American Statesmen*, New York, 1860; Montague, William, Memoir of Fisher Ames, *Diocesan Register for 1812;* Warren, Winslow, Fisher Ames, *Dedham Historical Register*, **9**: 1898; Warren, Charles, *Jacobin and Junto, or early American politics as viewed in the diary of Dr. Nathaniel Ames*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1931.

[16] See the hostile treatment of Ames by Parrington in his edition of *The Connecticut wits*, xix–xxii, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1926. Similar evaluations will be found in Bowers, Claude G., *Jefferson and Hamilton; the struggle*

Washington have been presented as typical examples of the Federalist mind. Of course, the historian usually invites criticism when he attempts to label as "typical" any individual or a complex body of thought which exhibits local and personal variations. Federalism was by no means a monolithic intellectual structure. As exhibited by such figures as Adams, Hamilton, Washington, Marshall, and the Pinckneys, it often assumed a regional coloration. Yet these differences were reflected in policies and emphasis rather than in social philosophy. Throughout the writings of the Federalist leaders one finds the assumption if not the insistence upon the fallible nature of man, the propensity of liberty to run to license, the resulting dangers of democracy, and the need for independent, coercive powers in government protected by constitutional provision against interference from the representative bodies. As far as basic social philosophy is concerned, and often if not always in the realm of policy, Fisher Ames was an acknowledged spokesman for the Federalist leadership in so far as any one individual can be said to be a party spokesman. Of course his expression of Federalist philosophy, his perfervid, sometimes hysterical rhetoric was his own. But still he differed from the other Federalists in this regard only in degree. He had the power to express in vivid language the hopes—of which there were few—and the fears—of which there were many—of less articulate but equally devoted colleagues. His writings illustrate vividly the sources of strength and the fatal weaknesses of the Federalist leadership. They help to explain how a party whose members played a prominent part in writing the longest lived constitution in modern history, who constructed an efficient governmental machinery, who managed with sometimes brilliant success the domestic, foreign, and financial affairs of an infant nation, were cast aside by the American people after a decade of power and live today mainly as curiosities from "the tie wig school."

## II

Dedham, Massachusetts—the town in which Fisher Ames was born in 1758 and in which he spent most of his life—is today little more than a suburb of Boston huddled beside a noisy overpass on Route 1 just outside the clutches of South Boston. But in the eighteenth century it was a pleasant and prosperous farming community of twenty-five or thirty houses on the Boston-Providence road, an easy afternoon's drive from the metropolis. Fisher's father was the celebrated Dr. Nathaniel Ames, editor of the almanacs, physician, astronomer, innkeeper, versifier, and local seer. The almanacs make it plain that Dr. Nathaniel considered himself a man of the people and viewed the rich and well born with considerable suspicion. Interspersed among the literary excerpts, astronomical information, homey philosophy and poetry are the doctor's constant warnings to his readers to beware of lawyers, quack doctors, and hair-splitting theologians. The popularity of the almanacs is illustrated by the fact that they were outsold only by those of Poor Richard.[1]

Nathaniel's crusty character is illustrated by a well-known story concerning him. Having lost a law suit because of what he considered to be a hostile bias on the part of the judges, he set up a sign over the door of his inn depicting the judges in a riotous drinking bout, their backs to a large volume labelled *Province Law*. When news of this contempt reached Boston, the court sent the Sheriff of Suffolk county and a posse of deputies to remove the offensive sign. But when the posse arrived in Dedham they found a new one in its place carrying the words of Scripture, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh a sign, but no sign shall be given to them." Throughout his life Dr. Nathaniel had a reputation for always having the last word.[2]

Fisher's mother, who managed the inn and outlived her son by ten years, was well educated for the time and was known as a "strong-minded woman"—a term of mingled admiration and reproach in the eighteenth century. She took a lively interest in politics and hated Jacobins with a passion equalled only by that of her illustrious offspring.

As young Fisher and his elder brother, Nathaniel Jr., grew up in the old inn with its view over the fields to the marshy banks of the Charles River, the two diverged sharply in personality, interests, and objectives. Nathaniel took over the editorship of the almanacs after his father's death, carried them on in identical fashion, be-

*for democracy in America*, 302, Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1925; Brant, Irving, *James Madison, father of the constitution, 1787–1800*, 248, 267, New York and Indianapolis, Bobbs Merrill, 1950; Schachner, Nathan, *The founding fathers*, 35–36, New York, Putnam, 1954.

[1] See Briggs, Samuel, *The essays, humor, and poems of Nathaniel Ames, father and son, from their almanacs, 1726–1775*, Cleveland, 1891.

[2] Thayer, *Ames*, 279.

came a physician and a rabid Republican—this last to the intense mortification of Fisher. Nathaniel was in every sense a chip off the old block. When Federalist townsmen, annoyed at his political heresy, gave him the title "Grumbleton the Jacobinite," he proved that he had inherited his father's talent for recrimination. With fine impartiality he labelled lawyers "dogs of the law," the county bar association "a conclave of Jesuits," and the Federalist Party the "prigarchy" or "pettifogarchy,"[3] Fisher, unlike his brother, gravitated toward his mother and eventually turned his back on most of what his father and brother stood for. At six he began the study of Latin and was well along in the classics by the time he entered Harvard at twelve. Here, according to his clerical biographer, he "soon gained the reputation of shining parts." Not the least of his achievements, in Dr. John T. Kirkland's view, was his avoidance of the many pitfalls which beset the step of undergraduates. He sowed no wild oats, consorted only with respectable characters, sought and won the esteem of his tutors. In 1774 he emerged at the ripe age of sixteen, "a spotless youth," having "passed the ordeal of four-years residence at the university unhurt" and having "surmounted the temptations to vice perhaps inseparable from the place."[4]

While at college, after considering the ministry, Ames decided to study law. For a time following graduation, however, he was compelled, by stringent family finances resulting from his father's death, to teach school and help tend the tavern. During this period he continued his reading, covering the Greek and Roman classics, and everything within his reach in the fields of history, philosophy, and English literature. As was the case with John Adams and many other conservatives before and since, this type of education enriched his intellect but somewhat rigidified his political views. In later life he constantly judged contemporary situations in the light of the distant past with which he was so familiar. For almost every discernible political trend of his times he found a historical parallel—usually of an alarming nature. America, in his eyes, was rushing toward the destruction which had overtaken Greece, Rome, and later republics. In many ways Ames's career illustrates the benefits and dangers of an education exclusively classical. It gave him an appreciation of moral and ethical values, an acquaintance with the variety and wealth of human nature, and a facility with the arts of communication. On the other hand it disparaged the value of experiment and cast suspicion on any form of progress which appeared to deviate from ancient precedent. Only men like Thomas Jefferson who could combine a rational political philosophy with a pragmatic political program could at once reap the benefits and escape the pitfalls of the classical education.

Several years after graduating from Harvard, Ames began his study of law in the office of William Tudor, the student of John Adams who was later to become a distinguished jurist. In 1781 Ames opened a practice in Dedham. As a lawyer he was only moderately successful and was never particularly happy in the profession. Travel about the state to the various court sessions and the usually uncomfortable accommodations exhausted him. He found also, as did many other young Ciceros of the profession, that the judges—usually justices of the peace with little or no legal training—had little patience with long-winded oratory. Since they tended to place the dispensing of justice in individual cases ahead of the application of the law, their decisions often seemed quixotic and arbitrary to young lawyers schooled on Coke-Littleton and Blackstone. Ames came to find the floor of the legislative assembly, where he could display his forensic talents to better advantage, more congenial to his tastes than the lawyer's desk in the courtroom.

Ames's first appearance in print came in 1786 as a defender of government against Shays' Rebellion. As he was to do so often at a later date, in his "Lucius Junius Brutus" and "Camillus" essays, published in the Boston *Independent Chronicle*, he expressed the mind of conservatives with clarity and vigor.

The depression which had followed the Revolutionary War and the imposition of higher taxes to service the state debt greatly increased the chronic money troubles of the debtor back-country farmers. Temporary expedients to allay the discontent such as a commodity tender act were gingerly tried by the government, but the measures proved inadequate. In 1784, for example, there were two thousand actions for debt at one time on the docket of the Court of Common Pleas.[5] In 1785 and 1786 four thousand suits

[3] See Warren, *Jacobin and junto*, 7.

[4] Ames, *Works* 1: 4. Dr. Kirkland was in a position to talk with some authority about vice at Harvard, for he was President of the college from 1810 to 1828.

[5] Handlin, Oscar and Mary F., *Commonwealth, A study of the role of government in the American economy: Mass-*

for debt were entered in Worcester County alone and seventy-two of the ninety-four inmates of the county jail were debtors. No property, of course, was exempt from seizure upon execution of judgment.[6] To add to the distress of the back-country, the legislature held to the policy of rapid amortization of the public debt, which by 1785 had risen to the staggering total of £1,468,554.[7] Western towns "groaned under the burden" of the crushing load of taxation necessary to service the debt and support the courts. In 1782, for example, one town declared that the taxes assessed in the preceding twelve months amounted to more than the value of all its improved property. In 1783 forty-two towns in Hampshire, twenty-two in Berkshire, and eleven out of the twelve in Bristol were delinquent in tax payments.[8]

In refusing to countenance any effective measures for relief of debtors, in coupling a deflationary economic policy with sheriffs' sales, the state government was in effect confiscating millions of dollars worth of property held by small farmers. If the people of Massachusetts had risen in arms to protect their property against Parliament, what more natural than that the back country would turn to violence to protect homesteads from the depredations of the state courts? The taxes imposed from abroad in the period from 1765 to 1774 had been only a threat to property; foreclosures and executions of judgment for debt from 1784 to 1786 were a direct assault upon it. The farmers who followed Daniel Shays were not revolutionaries bent upon overturning the government and redistributing wealth as Boston creditors claimed. Like the North Carolina Regulators of 1768 or the Mid-West farmers of 1933, they only wanted to keep what little they had. What theory lay behind Shays' rebellion was therefore as conservative as the theory of the creditors who suppressed it.

In view of Fisher Ames's humble financial circumstances and the lower class sympathies of his father and elder brother, we might expect that he would come to the aid of his own kind in the crisis. But not so. In the "Brutus" and "Camillus" essays, written during the fall of 1786, Ames called upon the government to give the rioters cold steel. Treason is abroad, he announced. The constitution is at stake. Bankrupts, sots and demagogues snatch for the supreme power. Further compromise will be both futile and fatal.

> It may be very proper to use arguments, to publish addresses, and fulminate proclamations against high treason; but a man who expects to disperse a mob of a thousand men by ten thousand arguments has never been in one. I have heard it remarked that men are not to be reasoned out of an opinion that they have not reasoned themselves into. The case, though important, is simple. Government does not subsist by making proselytes to sound reason, or by compromises and arbitration with its members; but by the power of the community compelling the obedience of individuals. If this is not done, who will seek its protection or fear its vengeance? Government may prevail in the argument, and yet we may lose the constitution.[9]

Like conservatives everywhere, he considered that such remedies for back-country distress as paper money, stay laws, and moratoria on litigation, would, if adopted, signify the end of organized society. Such measures were legalized robbery—no more, no less. "Relieve distress from your own funds," he advised the soft-headed and soft-hearted. "Am I to lose my property, and be involved in distress to relieve persons whom I never saw, and who are unworthy of compassion if they accept dishonest relief? If your virtues lead you to oppress me, what am I to expect from your vices?"[10]

There could be no doubt, from the "Brutus" article, that all of Fisher Ames's sympathies lay with the rich and well born who felt the threat of social revolution. The plight of the debtor farmers did not seem to touch him. Anticipating William Graham Sumner and Herbert Spencer, he felt that their difficulties arose partly from their own moral shortcomings and partly from the inevitable operation of natural economic laws. Repression alone, without a palliative of any sort, was Ames's answer to the commotions of Shays' Rebellion.[11]

*achusetts 1774–1861*, 43, New York, New York University Press, 1947.

[6] Morris, Richard B., Insurrection in Massachusetts, in Aaron, Daniel, ed., *America in Crisis*, 24, New York, Knopf, 1952.

[7] Taylor, Robert J., *Western Massachusetts in the revolution*, 104, Providence, Brown University Press, 1954.

[8] *Ibid.*, 108–109.

[9] Ames, *Works* 2: 95.

[10] *Ibid.*, 96.

[11] The harshness of Ames's solution is highlighted when his essay is compared with *The history of the insurrection* written by his dear friend, Harvard classmate, and fellow student in Tudor's office, George Richards Minot. As Secretary of the House of Representatives Minot shared the official attitude toward the rebellion, but he showed considerable sympathy for the debt-ridden farmers and a

Many of the characteristics of Ames's later conservatism appear in this short article. Government emerges as a stark mechanism of control and of punishment for wrongdoers—a concept quite different from the Revolutionary view of government as the instrument through which the people's will is translated into law and their natural rights given protection. Of course the Revolutionary generation, as prospective rebels, had needed justification for revolt; hence circumstances aided in the formulation of a liberal philosophy. In Shays' Rebellion they needed justification for repression, so it is understandable that the conservatives among them were driven to accept the coercive theory on which Parliament had acted. Ames, in emphasizing control over freedom, exemplified a shift in political thought that was to become more pronounced among conservatives as time went on. Federalists were to talk little about liberty unless their sectional interests were threatened, and were to stress the need for "vigor" and "energy" in government.

The imminence of crisis and the prognostications of doom announced by his article also became hallmarks of Ames's writing and characteristics of future Federalists generally. Organized groups out of power which need political protection for their interests—particularly propertied minorities—habitually view with alarm the policies of the incumbents of office. But with Fisher Ames and the Federalists the cry of crisis was too often raised with insufficient justification and reiterated too hysterically to carry weight over a long period of time. In viewing Shays' Rebellion as a prelude to anarchy, Ames was reflecting the conviction of many contemporary conservatives, but he was adopting a habit of exaggeration which eventually limited his effectiveness as a political writer.

It is interesting to note that, at the time Ames was crying havoc, Jefferson, commenting on Shays' Rebellion from Paris, suggested that occasional armed resistance to government served as a salutary reminder to officeholders that they were the people's servants, and not masters.[12] Probably if Jefferson had been writing from Springfield rather than from his comfortable home in Plessy he would not have been so complacent, yet even in times of adversity comparable to those experienced by Ames he never gave way to panic. His "sanguine" temperament always set him apart from the fearful Federalists.

In March, 1787, after the rebellion had been suppressed, Ames wrote three more articles of equal significance indicating the trend of conservative thought. His intent was to ascertain the causes of the late disturbances and suggest adequate safeguards against a repetition of them. What had happened, he felt, was that "The people have turned against their teachers the doctrines which were inculcated in order to effect the late revolution."[13]

For this the "teachers" (i.e., Revolutionary leaders), were principally responsible.

> They considered the contest with Britain as involving the fate of liberty and science. To animate and recompense their sufferings and toils during the conflict, their ardent enthusiasm had anticipated a system of government too pure for a state of imperfection. When they found that for the first time in the history of man, a nation was allowed by Providence to reduce to practice the schemes which Plato and Harrington had only sketched upon paper, they expected a constitution which would be perfect and perpetual. Then was the time to tell of virtue being raised from the dungeon, where priests and tyrants had confined her; then was the time to talk about restoring the golden age, without being laughed at; and many seemed to believe that a political millennium was about to commence.[14]

But then, what disillusionment! ". . . our heroes . . . found that their honored plan of freedom of election had produced a too faithful representation of the electors, and that something more, and something worse than public wisdom and integrity were represented." Vulgar clamor often made right of wrong and wrong of right. Legislatures often abused their trust by bowing to the passion and "ignorant prejudices" of constituents. The people actually expected to rule, and when blocked in their demand for power, formed revolutionary conventions which led straight to sedition.[15]

The basic cause of the present troubles, then, in Ames's view, was what he regarded as the visionary idealism of the Revolution. The enthusiasm of the struggle with Britain had blinded most men to the basic precepts of good government.

lively interest in measures of relief. See his *History of the insurrection in Massachusetts . . .*, Worcester, 1788.

[12] "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants," Ford, Paul L. ed., *The writings of Thomas Jefferson* **4**: 467, New York, 1892.

[13] Ames, *Works* **2**: 101.

[14] *Ibid.*, 102.

[15] *Ibid.*, 103.

They did not anticipate the peril from mobs and demagogues. "I am no advocate for despotism," wrote Ames, "but I believe the probability to be much less of its being introduced by the corruption of our rulers, than by the delusion of the people."

The solution for the difficulties was coercion, as Ames had indicated before, but now, with the talk of a convention to amend the Articles of Confederation in the air, Ames amplified his proposal. Not only should the authority of government in Massachusetts be vindicated, but "It is time to render the federal head supreme in the United States."[16]

In coupling a demand for stronger central authority with a coercive theory of government, Fisher Ames was not speaking as a reactionary, but was voicing the sentiments of probably a majority of the men of substance in the United States. The course of politics during the Confederation period had demonstrated that the state governments, characterized by legislative supremacy and lacking adequate checks and balances, could be captured by majorities adverse to upper-class interests. What new means, then, could be found to protect property and private rights from a threatening majority will? The best answer, and one on which most political leaders could agree, was the strengthening of the central government by giving *it* the power to prevent states from infringing upon private rights. Of course the purpose of the new Federal Constitution was not solely to check majority will. The needs of national defense, the prevention of interstate quarrels, and the desire for a unified public administration were equally pressing. But it is safe to say that had not the propertied minority in the several states felt themselves threatened by the unpropertied majority, the desire for a stronger central authority would have been much weaker.

If Ames spoke for many others beside himself in his proposal to make "the federal head supreme in the United States," he was more nearly alone —at this date at least—in openly expressing disillusionment with popular government and scornfully disparaging the idealism of the Revolutionary fathers. The men who drafted the Constitution had wanted guarantees of liberty as well as of security; if they feared tyranny from below, they had not forgotten the possibility of suppression from above. The time was to come, in the feverish reaction to the French Revolution, when conservatives everywhere would adopt Ames's rhetoric, but as yet they thought that the situation called for reorganization rather than reevaluation of basic political principles. Ames's chronic anxiety led him to borrow trouble from tomorrow. In times of developing crisis, therefore, the event seemed to prove him an authentic seer. As the Western world headed into the upheavals of the French Revolution Ames's jeremiads had a compelling power for those who shared his fears.

In the fall of 1787 Ames was chosen to represent his town of Dedham in the Ratifying Convention for the Federal Constitution. In this body he brought himself to the attention of the political leaders of Massachusetts by a widely read speech on biennial elections, and so launched himself on a political career.

The biennial elections for the national House of Representatives aroused a good deal of opposition in Massachusetts, primarily because the provision ran contrary to a cherished local tradition which was conceived to be a major defense

[16] *Ibid.*, 106–107. The influence of Shays' Rebellion in hastening the call for the Convention of 1787 has often been noted. There were many reasons for a stronger central government, most of them very sound and practical by any standards, but the fear of further internal insurrection and of the mounting power of debtor-majorities in the states was perhaps the strongest immediate motivation for the gathering in Philadelphia. Madison, in the Convention, warned that "the insurrections in Massachusetts admonished all the states of the danger to which they were exposed." Prescott, Arthur T., *Drafting the Federal Constitution*, 82, University, Louisiana State University Press, 1941. Interferences with private rights and the impartial administration of justice, he said on another occasion, "perhaps more than anything else produced this convention." *Ibid.*, 203. Elbridge Gerry, citing Massachusetts as an example, complained, "The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy," and Roger Sherman, the one-time shoemaker from Connecticut, insisted that the people should have as little to do with government as possible because "They want information and are constantly liable to be misled." *Ibid.*, 198. It is needless to multiply quotations. Albert J. Beveridge put it very well: "Look where one will among the class of men of whom Washington was the highest representative, one finds that they believed the fountain head of the country's desperate conditions to be in the people themselves." Beveridge, Albert J., *The life of John Marshall* 1: 307–308, Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1919. Chapter VIII of Volume 1 contains a good summary of what might be called the official opinion on the need for a stronger central government. An excellent treatment of the conservative point of view in Massachusetts is contained in East, Robert A., The Massachusetts conservatives in the Critical Period, in Morris, Richard B., ed., *The era of the American Revolution*, 349–393, New York, Columbia University Press, 1939.

against tyranny. Under the Charter of 1691 elections for both town delegates and councillors were held every year, and this procedure was considered a salutary means of preventing legislatures from falling under the influence of royal governors or becoming self-interested at the expense of constituents. There was a feeling that in the other royal colonies, where elections were held only at the will of the governor and councillors were appointed by the crown, the people were deprived of a valuable check on their representatives. Hence during the early Revolutionary period the saying became current, "Where annual elections end, tyranny begins." Annual elections were a feature of all the state constitutions drafted during the Revolutionary period. Although there were many controversial constitutional issues within the states at this time, this feature was considered a settled principle.

Thus it is understandable that only a few days after the Massachusetts Convention convened in June, 1788, members were on their feet criticizing the two-year term for members of the House of Representatives. "Annual elections have been the practice of this state ever since its settlement," said Dr. John Taylor, of Worcester, a leading anti-Federalist, "and no objections to such a mode of electing has ever been made—it has indeed, sir, been considered as the safeguard of the liberties of the people—and the annihilation of it, the avenue through which tyranny will enter."[17] Declared General Samuel Thompson, of Topsham, a "furious" anti-Federalist: "Let these members know their dependence upon the people, and I say it will be a check on them, even if they are not good men." At this point, according to the reporter, the General then broke out into a "pathetic apostrophe": "Oh my country, never give up your annual elections! Young men, never give up your jewel!"[18]

When Ames rose to speak in behalf of biennial elections, he apparently realized the necessity of a reverent approach if a cherished tradition was to be put aside. Biennial elections, he said, did not give representatives a dangerously long tenure of power, and were necessary because of the wide extent of the country and the training that new men would need in order properly to discharge their duties. "It is not by riding post to and from Congress that a man can acquire a just knowledge of the true interests of the Union." Toward the end of his speech, however, Ames discussed at considerable length the consideration that weighed most heavily with him—the tendency of a two-year term to strengthen the powers of control which government could bring to bear. "The people," he said,

> nourish factions in their bosoms which will subsist so long as abusing their honest credulity shall be the means of acquiring power. A democracy is a volcano, which conceals the fiery materials of its own destruction. These will produce an eruption, and carry desolation in their way. The people always mean right, and if time is allowed for reflection and information, they will do right. I would not have the first wish, the momentary impulse of the public mind, become law. . . . On great questions, we first hear the loud clamors of passion, artifice and faction. I consider biennial elections as a security that the sober, second thought of the people shall be law. . . . The member, chosen for two years will feel some independence in his seat; the factions of the day will expire before the end of his term.[19]

The great value of biennial elections, then, was the degree of independence from constituents given by the two-year term of office. The representative would be in a position where, as trustee of the public welfare, he could disregard popular clamors for unwise measures. "The representation of the people is something more than the people," said Ames. "The only thing the people can do by themselves is destroy a government." As in the articles on Shays' Rebellion, government emerges as a strong, coercive power created by the people to save themselves from their follies, greater than themselves in wisdom and virtue, capable of dispensing justice with an equal hand if not interfered with by the people. Liberty, as understood by the Revolutionary generation, had no place in his scheme. "The liberty of one depends not so much on the removal of all restraint from the individual as on the due restraint upon the liberty of others."[20]

As the debates ground on and the ratification of the constitution began to appear doubtful, Ames's anxiety approached the point of hysteria. At a critical juncture he made an impassioned plea for the men of '75 "to stand forth and throw aside all interested and party views. As it was necessary then, so it is necessary now," he de-

[17] Elliot, Jonathan, ed., *Debates . . . on the adoption of the Federal Constitution* 1: 28, Washington, 1827. For biographical details on Dr. Taylor see Harding, Samuel B., *The contest over the ratification of the Federal Constitution in Massachusetts*, 65, New York, 1896.

[18] Elliot, *Debates* 1: 38; Harding, *Ratification in Massachusetts*, 63–64.

[19] Ames, *Works* 2: 6–7.

[20] *Ibid.*, 4–5.

claimed, "to UNITE or DIE if we must."[21] This open identification of the Federalists with the patriots of the Revolution and the implied identification of the anti-Federalists with the Tories was too much for Mr. Amos Singletary, of Sutton. A leading anti-Federalist who had never spent a day in school but who had represented his town in the Provincial Congress during the Revolution, Singletary spoke for the small farmers. In a tirade at Ames and his friends which revealed again the perennial suspicion of back-country farmers for the ruling gentry, he declared,

> These lawyers and men of learning, and monied men, that talk so finely and gloss over matters so smoothly, to make us, poor illiterate people, swallow down the pill, expect to get into congress themselves; they expect to be managers of this constitution and get all the power and all the money into their own hands, and then will swallow up all us little folks, like the great Leviathan, Mr. President; yes, just as the whale swallowed up Jonah.[22]

Perhaps Ames realized that his emotional appeal had miscarried, for in the ensuing debates he was much more conciliatory. Yet in his final speech he reverted to florid, supercharged oratory on his favorite theme—the imminence of crisis. If the constitution were not ratified, he announced, "The period of our political dissolution is approaching. Anarchy and uncertainty attend our future state—and this we know, that Liberty, which is the soul of our existence, once fled, can return no more."[23]

Ames's performance in the Convention had projected him into the inner circle of the conservative group in Massachusetts which fought so hard for the Constitution—Rufus King, Christopher Gore, George Cabot, James Bowdoin, Theophilus Parsons, Caleb Strong, and Theodore Sedgwick. These were the associates and dear friends with whom he would pass the rest of his life. All became staunch Federalists, and—with the exception of Bowdoin and King—were identified with the Essex Junto. With political recognition also came social acceptance. His warm, engaging personality and easy, friendly manners gained him an ever widening circle of friends. Articulate spokesman for all conservative views, friend to order, subordination, and energetic government, inveterate foe of mobs, depreciation, and democracy, Fisher Ames, at thirty years of age, stood on the threshhold of a promising political career. That is, if such political orientation in rapidly changing America could provide a promising political career.

[21] Elliot, *Debates* 1: 112.
[22] *Ibid.*, 112–113.
[23] *Ibid.*, 161.

## III

The esteem in which Ames was held is indicated by the fact that he won election to the House of Representatives in a contest with Sam Adams in Adams's own Boston district. Although his name was still a synonym for liberty, Adams's reputation had suffered because of his ambivalent attitude toward the Constitution. Much more adept at throwing the rascals out than in constructive statesmanship, he needed a target for opprobrium in order to gain political orientation. Refusing his support to groups wishing to write democratic reforms into the State Constitution of 1780, he had allied himself with the conservative James Warren and appeared indifferent to attempts to institutionalize the equalitarian philosophy he had so vigorously expounded before 1776. He neither supported nor opposed the Federal Constitution, and as a result failed to share in the glory of those who secured its ratification. In the campaign for Congress Ames therefore had a large initial advantage. Adams's friends were constantly on the defensive, attempting to extenuate what many regarded as a lack of statesmanlike vision. Ames's victory, which probably came as no surprise under the circumstances, was nevertheless a considerable achievement for a young man who was a child when Adams was almost singlehandedly forging the Revolution in Massachusetts.[1]

Filled with enthusiasm for the new experiment in statecraft, Ames arrived at New York in March, 1789, to take his seat in the House of Representatives. He had apparently expected to find a transcendent legislative body composed of noble Romans, statesmen on the order of Cicero and Cato, outstanding for wisdom, virtue, and impartiality. Needless to say, he was considerably disillusioned. "I was sorry to see," he wrote to Minot, "that the picture I had drawn was so much bigger and fairer than life." He was distressed by the "yawning listlessness" of many members and—more serious—"their liableness to the impression of arguments *ad populum*; their state prejudices, their overrefining spirit in rela-

[1] Wells, William V., *The life and public services of Samuel Adams* 3: 277–282, Boston, 1866; Morse, Anson E., *The Federalist Party in Massachusetts to the year 1800*, 61n., Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1909; Warren, Fisher Ames, *Dedham Historical Register* 9: 70.

tion to trifles; their attachment to some very distressing formalities in doing business. . . . "[2]

Two men relieved this picture of mediocrity—Washington and Madison. The first he viewed as the personification of the ideal statesman. Calm, dignified, motivated solely by virtue and contemptuous of the crowd, Washington was the ideal by which Ames constantly strove to develop his own character, policies, and behavior.[3] This romanticism—for those who knew him well—softened the harshness of his polemical language and set him apart from the bitter Federalists like Timothy Pickering. But it also militated somewhat against his effectiveness as a politician. With an idealized picture of civic virtue before his eyes which as a practical matter was impossible of attainment, the ordinary course of politics often seemed vulgar and degrading. Ames's admiration for the ideal sometimes made it hard for him to adjust to the real.

For Madison, Ames had mingled sentiments of admiration and suspicion. He at once recognized the man who was to be his chief political antagonist and took his measure with care. He found Madison "possessed of a sound judgment, devoted to public business, and a thorough master of almost every public question that can arise."[4] Yet with due allowance for Madison's "great knowledge and merit," Ames saw "much error" in his principles and a distressing dependence upon the wishes of his Virginia constituents. Still, all in all, Ames admitted that Madison was the unquestioned leader of the House. "He is our first man."[5]

As a member of the House, Ames's record is remarkably consistent. In speeches and in voting he sought two complementary objectives—the protection of the political and economic interests of Massachusetts and the strengthening of the federal government. Making the United States an active commercial nation with a firm financial structure would increase the power of the federal government; the government in turn would utilize its resources to advance commercial interests. The future of the United States would be in effect the future of Boston writ large.

Ames's idealism, then, included a rationalized and transcendent picture of his constituents' material interests, as is the case with most politicians. This characteristic appeared plainly in his maiden speech. No abstruse philosophical discourse, it was a vigorous defense of a fiery commodity which had brought New England both profits and moral condemnation—rum. Congress had addressed itself at the outset of the session to the pressing question of revenue. Certainly all members agreed on the necessity of import duties, but all were equally anxious to relieve their constituents of as much of the burden as possible. When a tariff of eight cents a gallon on imported molasses was suggested, Ames was on his feet to protest. This excessive duty, he said, would ruin the New England distillers. The result would be unemployment, the loss of an important export, and diminution of the trade balances with which the West Indian molasses producers bought American provisions. Somewhat embarrassed by the moral disfavor with which rum was regarded, Ames "would concur in any measure calculated to exterminate the poison covered under the form of ardent spirits," but he did not want moral reform at the expense of the New England economy.[6]

Southerners and Westerners, favored by a happy combination of moral principle and economic interest, were firm in their determination to keep the duty on molasses high. The debate became bitter when the irrepressible James Jackson, of Georgia, pronounced New England rum "five hundred times as bad as that imported from the West Indies," and demanded a tariff on molasses high enough to discourage its manufacture. George Thatcher, a Massachusetts colleague of Ames, then noted that slavery was also considered a moral evil and asked Jackson what his reaction would be to a tariff of fifty dollars a head on imported negroes designed to diminish the nefarious slave trade. The ominous response to this suggestion from Southerners brought Madison to his feet observing that Thatcher's language did not express either "the deliberate temper of his own mind or the good sense of his constituents"—a comment possibly more astute than Madison realized in view of the intimate connection between rum and the slave trade.[7]

Ames then tried to untangle profits and morality by delivering his colleagues a lecture on political realism. "I treat as idle the visionary notion of reforming the morals of the people by a high duty on molasses. We are not to consider ourselves, while here, as at church or school, to

[2] Ames, *Works* 1: 44–45.
[3] *Ibid.*, 34.
[4] *Ibid.*, 49.
[5] *Ibid.*, 35–36, 42.
[6] Gales, Joseph, ed., *The debates and proceedings of the congress of the United States* 1: 140, Washington, 1834.
[7] *Ibid.*, 224, 227.

listen to the harangues of speculative piety; we are to talk of political interests committed to our charge. When we take up the subject of morality, let our system look towards that object, and not confound itself with revenues and the protection of manufacturers."[8] Then, perhaps to impress Southern distillers of whiskey, he concluded with the alarming suggestion that the principle of taxing alcoholic beverages, if carried too far, would "drive the people to drink simple water"[9]—a fear which time has proved to be unfounded. The outcome of the debate proved that rum had firm friends in the United States Congress. The House set the duty on molasses at five cents a gallon and the Senate reduced it to two and a half cents, a figure which the House then accepted and which was lower than the duty during the colonial period.

With undeviating consistency Ames supported all economic legislation which would benefit his section, and usually managed to present his arguments in such a way that the advantage of New England became the advantage of the nation. But of equal importance to him was the prestige and power of the federal government and the protection of the executive branch from the attacks of "violent republicans." Most of these incendiaries, he felt, could be found in the South, a land of ". . . negroes, debts, and luxury, but neither trade, nor credit, nor cash, nor the habit of industry, or of submission to a rigid execution of law."[10] He supported the proposal to give the president the power to dismiss federal appointees without consent of the Senate,[11] defended the right of the Secretary of the Treasury to submit financial proposals to Congress,[12] and defended Hamilton against Giles's resolutions of censure.[13] Madison's Bill of Rights (the first ten amendments) he considered a demagogic trick.

> I am commonly opposed to those who modestly assume the rank of champion of liberty and make a very patriotic noise about the people. It is a state artifice which has duped the world a thousand times. . . . I love liberty as well as anybody . . . but I would guard it by making the laws strong enough to protect it.[14]

Hamilton's financial plans appealed to Ames because of their obvious value in strengthening the federal government. As "colossus of the monocrats" and as "Hamilton's gladiator," as he was often called, he gave his best oratorical efforts to the projects of funding the national debt at par, assuming the state debts, and establishing a national bank. Because of his intense partisanship he was inevitably accused of seeking personal gain. William Maclay wrote, for example, that when the assumption bill failed in its first test in the House, "Ames's aspect was truly hippocratic—a total change of face and features; he sat torpid, as if his faculties had been benumbed."[15] Ames in 1794 admitted investing $600 in the three and six per cent public funds and $1,200 in stock of the Bank of the United States,[16] but there is apparently no truth to the gossip of a Dedham neighbor, reported by Jefferson, that Ames had made "a very great fortune" speculating in the funds.[17] Ames's assertion that the Massachusetts members of Congress "do not draw enough income from funded stock to buy the oats for the Southern members' coach horses"[18] is a typical exaggeration, yet none of Ames's friends became wealthy as a result of stock holdings and Ames himself in later life thought stocks and bonds so precarious that he invested most of his capital in land.[19]

In his speeches on financial matters Ames for the most part reiterated the arguments made by Hamilton in the *Reports*, but on the question of the constitutionality of the Bank it was perhaps Ames who influenced Hamilton. In a powerful argument in behalf of loose interpretation of the Constitution and the use of implied powers, he made a statement which was reflected later in Hamilton's opinion on the Bank Bill and in McCulloch v. Maryland:

> Congress may do what is necessary to the end for which the Constitution was adopted, provided it is not repugnant to the natural rights of man, or to those which they have expressly reserved to themselves, or to the powers which are assigned to the states.[20]

Ames's efforts to strengthen the authority of government were never as successful as he hoped.

[8] *Ibid.*, 231–232.
[9] *Ibid.*, 233–234.
[10] Ames, *Works* 1: 104.
[11] *Annals of Congress* 1: 492–496; 559–564.
[12] *Ibid.*, 619; *Ibid.* 3: 715–722.
[13] *Ibid.*, 945.
[14] Ames, *Works* 1: 53–56.
[15] *The journal of William Maclay*, 237, New York, 1890.
[16] Morison, Samuel E., The India ventures of Fisher Ames, 1794–1804, *Proc. Amer. Antiquarian Society, N.S.*, 37: 14, 1927.
[17] Ford, Paul L., ed., *The works of Thomas Jefferson* 1: 354, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.
[18] Ames, *Works* 1: 142.
[19] Morison, Squire Ames and Dr. Ames, *New England Quart.* 1: 24.
[20] *Annals of Congress* 2: 1956.

Congress refused his plan to alter the ratio of representation in order to keep the House small and select, limited to the "proper characters to serve in a legislature."[21] The Committee of Ways and Means, in his view, continued to encroach upon the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury. The executive power, he complained, was "a mere pageant of the representative body." The House itself was little better. "We ourselves are but passive instruments whenever the sovereign people choose to speak for themselves instead of our speaking for them." In fine, "experience has not laid on her lessons of birch, and we forget them. Our whole system is little removed from a simple democracy. What we call government is a phantom, . . ."[22]

Ames had no patience with the type of earthy politics so common in all democratic governments. With ancient models in mind, he expected that law making would be a kind of Lycurgine function in which rules would be formulated by wise, impartial, disinterested statesmanship and imposed by an inflexible but just will. He envisaged government as a force set apart from the people, and he measured its effectiveness by its independence of the people. It was Ames's misfortune that the whole course of American development ran contrary to his ideal. American government in action soon came to exhibit many of the caprices and inconsistencies which he so deplored in the American people. He could never realize that the strength and endurance of the political system rose not so much from its constitutional framework or energetic administration as from its representative quality. Fumbling and shortsighted though government might sometimes be, it could always command the people's loyalty because it was their own. For better or for worse, government of, by, and for the people was the nation's destiny—a destiny to which Fisher Ames could never become reconciled.

## IV

After 1793 the course of foreign affairs darkened the already somber hue of Ames's political ideas. His thought came to be dominated by an obsessive fear of the French Revolution. Convinced that the nature of man was basically depraved, he felt that the unpropertied majority needed little encouragement to dispossess the propertied minority, and in the process destroy free government and all civil liberties. Proletarian revolt would always have the same outcome, whether the insurgents were the followers of Daniel Shays or of Robespierre—an armageddon in which the virtuous elite would perish at the hands of a raging mob.

The wars of the French Revolution, Ames regarded as the first phase of a titanic struggle which might soon engulf the whole world and loose the horrors of liberty, equality, and fraternity upon the stable and contented American people. The French nation was for him a reincarnation of ancient Rome, bent upon world domination. According to his analysis, the doctrines of democracy and equality had awakened the latent love of violence in the French people and had flattered their vanity. The demagogues conducting the Revolution had been quick to turn this situation to their own advantage. They threw the infatuated nation into war and thus provided a pretext for despoiling the nobility and seizing the sovereign power. "How dear a triumph for republicanism!" concluded Ames. "How lofty a stage for equality!"[1] Ames regarded himself as the Jeremiah of the American people discharging a divinely imposed duty to warn them of the awful fate which awaited if they followed in the footsteps of the French.

Britain was for Ames the first line of American defense. A symbol of ordered freedom, the benign parent of the United States, she was the natural ally of the American people against a world going mad. Moreover, since she was the best customer for American raw materials and provisions and the best source of supply for manufactured goods, economic interest as well as political considerations dictated close ties between the two nations.[2]

In the first Congress foreign policy had been overshadowed by pressing domestic concerns, but when Britain inaugurated restrictions on neutral trade in 1793 it became the most bitterly contested party issue. Madison, hoping to maneuver Britain into a trade treaty and gain American entry into the British West Indies, introduced resolutions in the House calling for discrimina-

[21] *Ibid.* 1: 748–749.

[22] Ames to Hamilton, Jan. 26, 1797, in Hamilton, John C., *History of the republic of the United States as traced in the writings of Alexander Hamilton and of his contemporaries* 6: 596–597, New York, 1864.

[1] Ames's reactions to the French Revolution are best illustrated in two series of essays: The new Romans, in *Works* 2: 173–191; and The dangerous power of France, in *ibid.*, 287–322.

[2] *Ibid.*, 152–169.

tions of various kinds against nations which had not negotiated agreements with the United States. He argued persuasively that the United States, as an importer of luxuries and an exporter of necessities, would be in a better position to undertake "a contest of self-denial" than manufacturing nations. By utilizing this natural advantage, then, America could gain respect for her neutral rights without resort to war.[3] The New England representatives, however, presented a solid front of opposition to Madison's resolutions. After nearly a month of debate Ames summed up their arguments in a speech which was widely admired and publicized.[4] Pointing out that the direct trade with England had increased rapidly with the onset of the war, he warned that it would be the veriest folly to risk the loss of this source of profit by badgering Britain for American entry into the West Indies. Listing Britain's alternative sources for American produce, he pointed out that Madison had greatly overestimated the effectiveness of commercial restrictions as a means of gaining concessions. The policy had been tried in 1774, he said, and had failed. "The wonder-working paper on the table" (Madison's resolutions) would by no means induce the British to abandon trade policies of 150 years' duration. Hinting that the Republicans were seeking a quarrel with Britain, he concluded by observing that it was "wrong to make our trade wage war for our politics."[5]

In this speech Ames clearly exposed the fateful misconception of Jefferson and Madison that economic coercion would force Britain and France to respect American neutral rights—the misconception responsible for the embargo of 1807–1809 and the subsequent restrictions which culminated in the War of 1812. Yet for nearly twenty years the Republicans stubbornly placed their faith in economic pressure and avoided adequate military and naval preparations. It was a policy fraught with disaster, and only favorable circumstances enabled the Republicans to avoid paying the full price for their mistake.

Only the first of Madison's resolutions passed. A short time later when the country was enraged over British ship seizures in the West Indies, a thirty-day embargo was put into effect. The larger issues of the resolutions then were merged into the controversy over Jay's treaty.

[3] *Annals of Congress* **4**: 155–158.

[4] Pickering called it "A small masterpiece." Pickering Papers, **47**: 209, Massachusetts Historical Society.

[5] *Annals of Congress* **4**: 328–349.

No issue since the Revolution had so divided the nation. The press hurled epithets with reckless abandon, thunderous mass meetings in every city of the nation denounced the treaty, Jay was burned in effigy and his hated document consigned to the flames scores of times. Certainly the treaty was a disappointment to Federalists and Republicans alike, but its provisions alone cannot explain the storm of protest. In part the secrecy with which the treaty was negotiated and ratified was responsible for the outcry. Perfervid Republicans were easily led to believe that the Senate and the President were secretly trying to sell out the nation to Britain.[6] In part the opposition stemmed from injured economic interests and a fear that basic American principles of international law were being jettisoned. But more important was the fact that the treaty brought into sharp focus the opposition to Federalist policies which had been growing since the establishment of Hamilton's financial system. Now given ideological polarity by the French Revolution, the protest against funds, banks, speculators, taxes, and the "paper aristocracy" became a full-throated roar. The French nobility and their monarchist friends in Britain provided stereotypes which could be applied to the Federalists, and in the heat of the fray to defend liberty and equality humble American Republicans transformed themselves into Robespierres and Dantons. The ÇA IRA screamed in twelve-point type by a New Hampshire newspaper sounded uncomfortably like a promise.[7]

The debate on the treaty in the House, which lasted from March 7 to April 29, 1796, began when Washington requested an appropriation to carry the document into effect. Robert R. Livingston then moved that the House request the instructions and diplomatic correspondence pertinent to the treaty, and thereby touched off a vigorous, well-reasoned, but inconclusive debate on the extent of the House's participation in the treaty-making power. When Washington refused to submit the documents, on the unanimous advice of his cabinet, the foes of the treaty strove mightily to prevent an appropriation, and the debate moved into its final phase.

Ames entered the fray only at the end, partly

[6] The terms of the treaty only became known when Senator Stevens T. Mason, of Virginia, as a protest against the rule of secrecy, published the treaty in the newspapers.

[7] Schachner, Nathan, *The founding fathers*, 365, New York, Putnam, 1954.

because of illness, and partly because the federal managers wanted to save his talents for a last ringing plea which might stampede the few waverers whose votes would decide the fate of the treaty. Since the past summer he had been suffering from the malady which was to carry him off twelve years hence. Periodically he was "oppressed," "languid," with "little appetite," "deranged in stomach and head." "My actual complaints are trival," he wrote, "but the cause they spring from is not. The *vis vitae* is on the ebb, the momentum of my blood is impaired. My case is more that of an old man than a sick one."[8] Sick or well, however, the Federalists in Congress desperately needed his presence in the session of 1796. Protesting that "my country's good alone could draw a man so sick from home,"[9] he left Dedham late in January and reached Philadelphia after a miserably cold journey on which he was often "so ill as to come near fainting." In the ensuing months he was probably little better, for his name seldom appears in the votes of the House.

As the debate on the treaty moved into its last two weeks, an air of crisis hung over Congress. Obscure members who usually sat silent now spoke with earnestness and conviction. "[The treaty] is a subject of the greatest importance that has ever been discussed since the establishment of the present government," said Thomas Henderson of New Jersey. "The moment is big with events," declared Isaac Smith, also of New Jersey. "The Rubicon is close before us."[10] While petitions poured in the argument grew steadily hotter. Both sides used extravagant language. The advocates of the treaty foresaw war, the overturning of the Constitution, and disunion if it was not carried into effect. Opponents charged that it betrayed basic American principles, insulted France, and meekly returned the United States to colonial status—a cock boat in the wake of the British man-of-war. By April 28 rational appeals had been exhausted. All that could be said in favor of the treaty had been repeated scores of times. What remained was for Fisher Ames to set it to music.

The Senate and the Supreme Court adjourned for the occasion. The galleries were packed. It was a stimulating opportunity for Ames to display all the histrionic abilities at his command, and he utilized it to the full. Like the elder Pitt trundled into the House of Commons to urge continuation of the French war, Ames at the outset made it plain that this was to be his swan song, the valedictory of a statesman gasping out his last breath for the welfare of his country. "I entertain the hope," he began, clutching a bottle of smelling salts, "perhaps a rash one, that my strength will hold me out for a few minutes." It did, for a 12,000-word address that covers twenty-four pages of the *Annals of Congress* and would have taxed the leather lungs of Daniel Webster. In some detail he reviewed the arguments in favor of the treaty and stressed the fact that its implementation was now a matter of good faith. Any denial of this proposition was "a monstrous opinion which stands in little need of remark, and if it does, lies almost out of the reach of refutation."[11] Proceeding to another topic, so as not to "abuse the momentary strength that is lent to me by the zeal of the occasion," he asserted that public opinion was mainly in favor of the treaty. Those supposed to suffer by the commercial restrictions were its strongest advocates. The opposition rose, he declared, not from reason, but from the passions generated by the French Revolution. Many opponents were by now so infatuated that they would not ratify *any* treaty with Britain.[12]

His most compelling eloquence, however, poured forth when he described the results to be expected from a rejection of the treaty. Those who had been injured by British spoliations would get no damages. The opponents of the treaty, "formerly so loud for redress, such fierce champions, that even to ask for justice was too mean and too slow, now turn their capricious fury upon the sufferers, and say, by their vote, to them and their families, 'No longer eat bread! Petitioners, go home and starve; we cannot satisfy both your wrongs and our own resentments.' "[13] But the worst sufferers would be the frontiersmen who would have to cope with Indians incited to fury by the British in their Western posts. All the violent imagery of his anxiety found expression in an appeal which was both superb eloquence and superb politics.

> On this theme my emotions are unutterable. If I could find words for them—if my powers bore any proportion to my zeal—I would swell my voice to such a note of remonstrance it should reach every log-house beyond the mountains. I would say to the

[8] Ames, *Works* 1: 174–175.
[9] *Ibid.*, 185.
[10] *Annals of Congress* 5: 1158.
[11] *Ibid.*, 1243.
[12] *Ibid.*, 1248–1249.
[13] *Ibid.*, 1257.

inhabitants, wake from your false security! Your cruel dangers—your more cruel apprehensions—are soon to be renewed; the wounds, yet unhealed, are to be torn open again. In the daytime your path through the woods will be ambushed; the darkness of midnight will glitter with the blaze of your dwellings. You are a father; the blood of your sons shall fatten your corn field! Yor are a mother; the war whoop shall waken the sleep of the cradle! . . . The Western inhabitants are not a silent and uncomplaining sacrifice,

Ames warned gentlemen from the South.

The voice of humanity issues from the shade of their wilderness. It exclaims that while one hand is held up to reject this treaty, the other grasps a tomahawk, . . . I can fancy that I listen to the yells of savage vengeance and the shrieks of torture. Already they seem to sigh in the West wind; already they mingle with every echo from the mountains.[14]

If the treaty was rejected, concluded Ames, "slender and almost broken as my hold on life is, I may outlive the government and constitution of my country."

As Ames fell back exhausted into his seat the triumphant Federalists called for the question, possibly expecting new allies from the Western Republicans who were the objects of Ames's sudden solicitude. In consternation Abraham Venable of Virginia moved adjournment, which was carried.

The impact of the speech was tremendous. Dr. Joseph Preistley, who was present and who had heard much impressive oratory in the House of Commons, called it the most bewitching piece of parliamentary oratory he had ever listened to. Ames "addressed himself to every faculty of the mind, and awakened every feeling and emotion of the heart. The effect," concluded Dr. Priestley, "was absolute enchantment."[15] John Adams, who was seldom carried away by emotion, declared Ames "made an impression that terrified the hardiest and will never be forgotten." "My God, how great he is," exclaimed Justice James Iredell, who was sitting with Adams. "He has been noble," replied Adams. "Tears enough were shed," Adams wrote to his wife. "Not a dry eye, I believe, in the House except some of the Jackasses who had occasioned the necessity of the oratory."[16]

[14] *Ibid.*, 1258–1260.

[15] Quoted from Samuel E. Morison's sketch of Fisher Ames in *The Dictionary of American Biography.*

[16] Adams, Charles F., ed., *Letters of John Adams addressed to his wife*, 226–227, Boston, 1848. One hearer declared that when Ames touched on the border war, "I shuddered and looked behind me, for I fancied a big Indian with uplifted tomahawk standing there." Parker, Edward G., *The golden age of American oratory*, 134–135, Boston, 1857. The belligerent Republican, Benjamin Austin, labelled the speech a "farce," however, and gave a sarcastic account of Ames's delivery in a newspaper article of 1803. Austin was not present when the speech was given, and grievances of long standing against Ames would have made it difficult for Austin to reach an objective judgment in any case. Warren, *Jacobin and Junto*, 65.

Great as the speech was, however, it apparently changed few votes. In the balloting which followed, party lines held firm and the treaty was saved by the narrow margin of 51 to 48.[17] Western Republicans had apparently recovered from the vision of disaster revealed to them. Nevertheless, Ames's performance gave him a firm position in the ranks of great American orators and was remembered long after Federalism had passed on. For example, George S. Boutwell, one of Grant's Secretaries of the Treasury, recalled late in life that Lincoln greatly admired the speech and could repeat long sections from memory.[18] Certainly by all standards of composition, rhetoric, and delivery it is one of the finest examples of the lost art of oratory.

## V

His dire prediction to the contrary, Ames made a rapid and not entirely unexpected recovery after the speech on the treaty. Yet in the summer of 1796 his old complaints returned and with them a deep depression. Under the circumstances, then, he decided not to run for re-election in the fall. "My ties to this life are not stronger than a cobweb," he wrote. Moreover, he professed to believe that small abilities gave him no further claim to public employment. In an orgy of self-pity he complained that he "was never more than a shepherd's dog; and my friends have been too civil sometimes in their praise of my barking when the thieves and wolves were coming. . . . I shall do ill as a lawyer," he went on dismally. "I wish therefore, I really do wish, to be obscure at home, where my wife and children etc. will think of me as I wish. The world would find me out if I was placed in any new post."[1]

Actually, Ames had been a popular Congressman. In 1790 he was re-elected over his Republican opponent, Benjamin Austin, by a vote of

[17] *Annals of Congress* 5: 1291.

[18] Boutwell to Erastus Worthington, Aug. 26, 1892, Worthington's Memoranda, Dedham Historical Society.

[1] *Works* 1: 203.

1724 to 348.[2] In 1794 he defeated the noted Dr. Charles Jarvis in a lively campaign.[3] Madison gossipped, however, that he owed his success to the votes of Negroes and British sailors "smuggled in under a very lax mode of conducting the election"—an unlikely explanation in view of Ames's popularity.[4]

In 1792 Ames made a very fortunate marital alliance with the Worthington family of Springfield which brought him financial independence and social position. His wife was described as "a large, stately woman with fine eyes and a remarkably dignified and most gracious presence, most friendly to all sorts of people, an immense reader and an admirable talker."[5] Perhaps significantly, Mrs. Ames was a woman very much like Fisher's mother. Shortly after the marriage Ames built a fine house in Dedham which became a sprightly social center for the Federalists thereabouts. It was pulled down in 1933 to make way for a WPA Post Office—an event which would have given Ames the grim pleasure of seeing vindicated his prophecies as to the evil propensities of democratic parties. Theophilus Parsons, Christopher Gore, George Cabot, Timothy Pickering, Samuel Dexter, and celebrities passing through town like Gouverneur Morris and Alexander Hamilton, often gathered at the Ames house with their ladies for gay dinner parties. When in health their host charmed everyone with his ready wit, gracious manners, and unfailing kindness. Few of his contemporaries surpassed him as a raconteur. His friends claimed that in this regard he could even hold his own with Gouverneur Morris, which was high praise indeed.

Ames's income came from a variety of sources, not the least of which was his wife's fortune. When he was able he practiced law, but the demands of the profession were too much for his physical condition and he gave it up shortly after leaving the House of Representatives. Much of his time he devoted to his farm. Like Adams and Pickering—among his Federalist friends—he was interested in scientific agriculture. He wrote articles on farming for the newspapers and experimented with the breeding of hogs and cattle.[6] Although he apparently never speculated in the funds or in bank stock, he entered into some risky mercantile ventures with William Gray of Salem which fortunately turned out quite profitably.[7]

Yet the bucolic life of a Dedham country squire was not entirely satisfying to the savior of the Jay treaty. At times he regretted his retirement from politics. "I am not a sentry, not in the ranks, not in the staff," he once lamented to a friend. "I am thrown into the wagon as part of the baggage; I am like an old gun that is spiked and the trunions knocked off, and yet am carted off, not for the worth of old iron, but to balk the enemy of a trophy."[8] A voluminous correspondence provided partial compensation for his occasional dissatisfaction with the quiet life. His former colleagues—Pickering, Hamilton, Cabot, Wolcott, and Sedgwick—were bountifully supplied with advice on public affairs, whether they had asked for it or not. Ames's thinking was so typical of the Federalist outlook that it is difficult to say whether he was more influential than influenced. In his letters there is the combination of nationalism and sectionalism, of practical solutions for immediate problems and visionary schemes for the future, of broad vision and pettiness, of public spirit and private interest, that characterized the Federalist Party of the 90's.

Thus he heartily endorsed the undeclared war with France in 1798, partly because it would strike a blow against the French Revolution and partly because it would unite the people behind the Federalist Party. But it should be "a full scale war," he wrote to Pickering, "waged but not declared and limited to the existence of the vile acts [of the French]."[9] The Sedition Act also received his full approval. "The struggle with our Jacobins," he declared, "is like the good Christian's with the evil one. . . . The government must display its power *in terrorem*, or, if that be neglected or delayed, in earnest. So much irritable folly and credulity, managed by so much villainy, will explode at last; and the issue will be tried, like ancient suits, by wager of

[2] Worthington, Historical Memoranda, Dedham Historical Society.

[3] Robinson, William, *Jeffersonian democracy in New England*, 10, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1916.

[4] Hunt, Gaillard, ed., *The writings of James Madison* **6**: 229, New York and London, G. P. Putman's Sons, 1907.

[5] Worthington, Historical Memoranda.

[6] Thayer, *Ames*, 292. Among Ames's papers in the Dedham Historical Society are letters describing his activities in this regard.

[7] See Morison, The India adventures of Fisher Ames, 1794–1804, *Proc. Amer. Antiquarian Society*, N. S., **37**: 14–23.

[8] Warren, Ames, *Dedham Historical Register* **9**: 77.

[9] Pickering Papers, **22**: 189–191, Massachusetts Historical Society.

battle."[10] Understandably, Ames gave his full support to Hamilton when the rift appeared between Hamilton and Adams over the continuation of the War with France. In part his attitude was due to the great affection he had held for Hamilton since the days when Ames had led the fight for the funding plans and the bank in the House. In part it was due to the conviction which he shared with the other high Federalists that the war should be continued until Jacobinism was completely stamped out and the Democratic-Republican party thoroughly discredited. Thus Adams' decision, on his own responsibility, to open negotiations with France in 1799 appeared to Ames as treason to the very principles of Federalism. Unable to understand why Adams would abandon a foreign policy so vital to maintaining the party's power, he ascribed the move to caprice. Adams was, Ames wrote to Rufus King,

> too much the creature of impulse or freakish humor —he is a revolutionist from temperment, habit, and lately what he thinks policy—he is too much irritated against many if not most of the principal sound men of the country even to bestow on them *his* confidence or to retrieve *theirs*. In particular he is implacable against a certain great little man whom we mutually respect.[11]

When Adams dismissed Pickering and McHenry from the cabinet in 1800, the high Federalists determined to read him out of the party and make Charles Cotesworth Pinckney their standard bearer. Yet this involved the considerable risk of splitting the party on the eve of the election, for Adams was popular with rank and file Federalists the country over. To accomplish the delicate surgery of removing Adams from the party without destroying its chances for victory, Hamilton circularized among Federalist leaders a letter criticizing Adams but urging that he be supported for the sake of party unity. Hamilton hoped that enough Federalist electors would then swing to Pinckney to give him first place on the ticket. If party conventions had been in use at the time the intrigue might have been successful, but without these convenient implements for political maneuver, and with the confusing electoral process which preceded the Twelfth Amendment, it was doomed to failure.

Ames, while fully agreeing that Adams should be purged, felt that the scheme was risky because of the lack of unity within the party. "The truth is," he wrote to Wolcott, "that our party is feeble. Doubts infect the timid, . . ." A better plan would be to "sound the tocsin about Jefferson." Awaken the people to the menace of a Jacobin president, he advised. Reveal how he will first be conciliatory, if elected, and then gradually build up a party of *sans culottes* who would plunder the country and overturn the Constitution.[12] This solution to the problem was Ames's old tactic of fear inculcation which had worked well in marshalling force against Shays' Rebellion, in securing ratification of the Constitution, establishing Hamilton's financial system, and saving the Jay Treaty. A nation alerted to disaster would presumably then turn for leadership to the party which, with acute foresight, had anticipated the crisis and had planned against it. But Hamilton, Pickering, and Wolcott were too deeply involved in intrigue to turn back. Hamilton started the circular letter on its journey, and Ames then cautiously endorsed the idea. The letter subsequently fell into the hands of Aaron Burr, who published it much to the glee of the Republicans and the chagrin of the Federalists. It probably played some part in Adams' defeat. Blinded by partisanship, Ames never appreciated the unethical nature of the conspiracy against Adams and never realized the extent of the political error of circularizing the letter. So implacable was his prejudice that he could write in December, 1800:

> The truth is, we were assaulted, rashly and unaccountably, by the head of our party, and we stood in our own defense with as much temper, forecast, and spirit, as men could. Scarcely any political transaction has seemed to me, on retrospect, so little liable to the reproach of bad play.[13]

Adams' defeat by no means satisfied the taste of the high Federalists for intrigue. The tie in the electoral college between Jefferson and Burr had no sooner been anounced than they began concocting a bargain with Burr, knowing that his principles were a highly negotiable commodity. If the Federalists could not elect their own man to office, at least they might be able to choose the first Republican President of the United States. The extent and terms of the negotiations with Burr will never be known because the participants were naturally reluctant to commit themselves on paper. Ames apparently knew

[10] Ames, *Works* **1**: 245, 247.

[11] King, Charles R., ed., *The life and correspondence of Rufus King* **3**: 305, New York, 1896.

[12] Gibbs, George, ed., *Memoirs of the administration of Washington and John Adams* **2**: 368–369, New York, 1846.

[13] Ames, *Works* **1**: 286–297.

in general what was transpiring in Washington, however, and suggested to his friend in the House, Theodore Sedgwick, that the following pledges be exacted from Burr in return for Federalist support:

1. The country must not be sold, given, or lent to France.
2. A quarrel must not be picked with Great Britain.
3. Credit, banks, etc. must be inviolable.
4. Trade must not be tampered with nor regulated. . . .

Apparently realizing the shady nature of the transaction, in view of the plain public preference for Jefferson, he closed the letter with the injunction, "Burn this instantly after possessing yourself of its contents."[14] Like James G. Blaine, who concluded the notorious Fisher letter with the same advice, Ames had his reputation to think of.

But by the end of January, as the balloting continued, Ames changed his mind about the advisability of a deal with Aaron Burr. It would be gratifying to report that he did so because of the ethical question involved, but such was not the case. There was no guarantee, Ames thought, that Burr would keep to an agreement. Indeed, in view of his past career, the Federalists could expect treachery. Moreover, if the Federalists succeeded in getting Burr elected over Jefferson, the Republicans would accuse them of raising a man to the presidency who was never intended for it by the people. The reputation of the Federalists would suffer, and at a time when the only hope for them—now a minority party—was a union with "the virtuous part of the public."[15] The fact that Jefferson was the preferred candidate of a majority of the electors—and presumably the public at large—was apparently a consideration of no importance for Ames. Nor was there any reason why it should be in view of his contempt for democracy.

After the election of Jefferson the volume of letters from Ames to his friends in Washington decreased. In part this was due to a realization of the futility of further intrigue, and in part to a firm conviction that the country would go to the dogs no matter what he did or said. He felt that virtue had been struck down by popularity and that true republicanism was dead. The real patriots had been cast aside, and faction—bred on envy, hatred, and licentiousness—had triumphed. Worse, New England had been brought "into an absolute subservience to the interest, or rather the ambition and envy of the Virginia planters."[16] Profoundly discouraged, Ames could only hope that by some miracle the night of the Jacobin would pass and that the nation would again be restored to the leadership repudiated in 1801.

[14] Ames to Sedgwick, Dec. 1, 1800, Sedgwick Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

[15] *Ibid.*, Jan. 23, 26, 1801.

## VI

The events of Jefferson's first administration only deepened the gloom of the Federalist leaders. With the repeal of the Judiciary Act of 1801 and the impeachment of Chase and Pickering, the Republicans seemed well on the way to capturing the only branch of the federal government in which the Federalist Party still had a foothold. The Louisiana Purchase promised to bring more states into the union to diminish the already waning influence of New England. The three-fifths ratio gave the expanding South an advantage in representation which could be justified by no political principle, democratic or otherwise. Even the burgeoning prosperity of the country worked against the Federalists by adding to the prestige of the Republicans. To most Federalists the stars in their courses seemed set against their party.

In a last gambit to hold the power that was so rapidly slipping away from them the Federalist leaders in Congress seized upon that desperate remedy of last resort held in reserve by disgruntled minorities—secession. The idea appears to have been first considered by Pickering and the Connecticut delegation to Congress—Hillhouse, Tracy, Hunt, and Griswold.[1] Pickering in January, 1804, disclosed a fully developed plan for a Northern Confederacy to George Cabot.[2] He received in reply what must have been a discouraging rebuff. "I greatly fear," wrote Cabot from Brookline, "that a separation would be no remedy *because the source of our evils is in the political theories of our country and ourselves. . . . We are democratic altogether*, and I hold democracy, in its natural operation, *to be the government of the worst.*"[3] The trouble was,

[16] "Observer," in *The New England Palladium*, Mar. 13, 1801.

[1] Brown, Charles R., *The Northern Confederacy according to the plans of the "Essex Junto," 1796–1814*, 34–35, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1915.

[2] Adams, Henry, ed., *Documents relating to New England Federalism, 1800–1815*, 338–342, Boston, 1877.

[3] *Ibid.*, 346.

Cabot went on, that democracy had made such inroads in Massachusetts that the Federalists probably could not even carry the state into a Northern Confederacy. And if they tried, they might very well lose what little influence they still had left. Theoretically the idea was a good one, Cabot acknowledged, but it could only be successfully carried out if the administration perpetrated intolerable injustice against New England. In his view the best plan was to await developments and hope that Jefferson would commit some outrageous act which would unify the New England states. Higginson, Parsons, and Ames—to all of whom Cabot had shown Pickering's letter—agreed entirely. "Nothing is to be done rashly," commented Ames, "but mature counsels and united efforts are necessary in the most forlorn cause. For though we may not do much to save ourselves, the vicissitudes of political Fortune may do everything; and we ought to be ready when she smiles."[4]

In an anonymous newspaper article Ames was even more outspoken against secession. A northern confederacy, if it could be formed, would continually be subjected to the subversive effects of "Parisian" democracy from the South. War in this case would be inevitable. The remedy of secession would prove worse than the disease of democracy.[5] There were only two ways, in his view, in which the Federalists could offer effective resistance to the triumphant Republicans—first, by striving for a tight party organization in New England which could control the state governments there, and second, by ceaseless newspaper propaganda exposing the iniquities of Jefferson and his followers. "The pen will govern," he declaimed, "until the resort is to the sword."[6]

Desperately Ames tried to whip his dispirited friends into action. In letter after letter he urged the greatest exertions in behalf of the party, alternating between black despair at the continuous success of the Republicans and visionary optimism for a revival of Federalist power. But his colleagues ignored the call to spread the gospel. "I am almost separated from all my federal friends," Ames complained at last to Christopher Gore. "They are lazy or in despair, and they urge, with wonderful eagerness, the futility of all exertions to retrieve the public mind from its errors."[7] To kinsman Thomas Dwight he continued in the same vein. "They depend upon our good sense and our good morals and still more on good fortune to put away the evil day. But it will come," he warned, "and it is near."[8]

Others might complacently allow themselves to be swept into the abyss, but Fisher Ames, at least, would go down fighting. Believing that the country was "too big for union, too sordid for patriotism, too democratic for liberty," he spent his last years as a lonely Jeremiah prophesying chaos.[9] In articles in the *Palladium* and in the *Repertory* he constantly exposed what he believed to be the villainous intentions of the Republicans, constantly rang the welkin calling all good men to the battle line, and constantly berated them for refusing to heed the call. The epigrammatic style, vivid imagery, and clever characterizations of his essays give them high literary quality, but as effective propaganda they were a failure. The trouble was that Ames was fighting for a lost cause with allies who had already surrendered. His brilliant language might win applause, but it could make few proselytes. The charges against the Jacobins could never be proved, and the prognostications of chaos were too apocalyptic to be credible. The prosperity of the country from 1801 to 1806 and Jefferson's successful first administration belied Ames at every point and gave an air of unreality to his rhetoric.

The elements of Ames's political philosophy, as revealed in his letters and newspaper essays, were for the most part the staple concepts of eighteenth-century conservatism which had been fully developed by John Adams and Edmund Burke—the fallible character and natural inequality of mankind, the propensity of liberty to run to license, the dangers of democracy, the necessity of checks and balances in government. He did, however, examine the idea of equality with more care than previous theorists and made it the central element of a rigid historical dialectic which is his most original contribution to political thought. Briefly, the dialectic may be stated thus: oppressive governments create a de-

[4] *Ibid.*, 356.
[5] The [Boston] *Repertory*, Aug. 31, 1804.
[6] *Works* 1: 314–315.
[7] *Ibid.*, 318.
[8] To Thomas Dwight, Feb. 19, 1804, Ames Papers, Dedham Historical Society.
[9] With the help of George Cabot and others, Ames induced the owner of the Newport *Repertory* to move to Boston and make his paper an organ of the Federalist Party. Ames to Isaac Davis, Jan. 6, 1804, Ames Papers.

mand on the part of the people for liberty. During the revolutionary process of gaining liberty self-interested factions arise which seek to exploit the emancipated people. As a means of securing the supreme power the leaders of these factions promise equal political rights and the abolition of social distinctions, realizing that these measures will flatter the people and allay their restiveness under restriction anu subordination. Since the people as a whole cannot be raised very much socially, intellectually, morally, or economically, and since the factions have no incentive to help them rise, equality therefore means the destruction of all individuals superior to the common herd and all values which the herd cannot appreciate. If the superior part of the community resists the process of equalization, it is destroyed by force; if it does not, it is separated from political power by the "equal" majority and deprived of its possessions. Superiority will not be tolerated; equality therefore means inevitably the destruction of the best part of society by the worst. Deprived of enlightened leadership, adrift without moral values, ever more firmly under the control of cynical, selfish leaders, society then languishes under a despotism as bad if not worse than the one originally overthrown.[10]

The most obvious example of the dialectic was of course France,

> that open hell, still ringing with agonies and blasphemies, still smoking with sufferings and crimes, in which we see the state of torment [of the French people] and perhaps our future state. There we see the wretchedness and degradation of a people who once had the offer of liberty, but have trifled it away; and there we see crimes so monstrous, that, even though we know they have been perpetrated, they still seem incredible.

America was going through the same process as France, Ames believed, but the dialectic was not so apparent because its progress was slower. Then too, the stable people of New England and the Federalist Party had put up a strong resistance to factional leaders. But this resistance, like all human endeavors, must eventually bow before the great historical force. He explained again how the American Revolution had unleashed popular will and had inspired potential demagogues "with a royal ambition to try their eloquence at the dram shop to gain subjects." Therefore, the vile doctrine of equality appeared as soon as liberty had been achieved. The adoption of the Constitution, with its checks and balances, and the hegemony of the Federalist Party, had temporarily held equality in check, but ultimate defeat of the wise and virtuous was certain. Jefferson and his party had ridden into power by exploiting the fatal appetite of the people and the last somber phase of the dialectic was beginning. "The Federal administration had nothing but integrity to rely on," lamented Ames as he fashioned a gravestone for American liberty.

> With the purest intentions it pursued the wisest measures, and looked for support to the reason and virtue of the citizens. But what support could reason and virtue afford? When the rage of party had drowned every voice but its own, those who excited those passions and those who had an interest in deceiving, have prevailed.[11]

What, then, did the future offer? What further measures of resistance could the wise and virtuous adopt? Ames's answer to both questions was—nothing. Imprisoned by his dialectic, he could foresee only a factional struggle within the Republican Party which would tighten the chains of tyranny. Meanwhile, future days would be

> heavy with the pressure of anxiety [and future nights] restless with visions of horror. We listen to the clank of chains, and overhear the whispers of assassins. We mark the barbarous dissonance of mingled rage and triumph in the yell of an infuriated mob; we see the dismal glare of their burnings and scent the loathsome steam of human victims offered in sacrifice.[12]

Ames's writing seems to be so thoroughly infected with hysterical and paranoid symptoms that it is difficult to believe that he represented a sane body of thought. Yet in this connection it must be remembered that his bitterest essays, including the morbid "Dangers of American Liberty," were published with great pride by his friends the year after his death. Pronouncements similar to his in spirit were continually made by Pickering, Cabot, Parsons, Wolcott, and other New England Federalist leaders. They loved Ames because he could articulate in more vivid language than they the mingled feelings of rejection, hatred, and anxiety that welled up in

[10] This theme, while general throughout Ames's works, can be seen most clearly in the following essays: Laocoon, *Works* 1: 109–128; Equality, *ibid.*, 207–228; The dangers of American Liberty, *ibid.*, 344–399; The Republican, Boston *Gazette*, Aug. 2, 6, 13, 16, 23, 27, 30, 1804.

[11] Republican, No. VIII, Boston *Gazette*, Aug. 23, 1804. See also The Paragraphist, No. V, Boston *Repertory*, Sept. 6, 1805.

[12] Dangers of American Liberty, *Works* 1: 354.

their own hearts. Seen in historical perspective, their language was by no means unique. The Whig followers of Henry Clay expressed themselves in much the same manner about Andrew Jackson, and the vocabulary of the Liberty League when speaking of Franklin D. Roosevelt was equally hysterical.

It was the misfortune of the Federalists that their political theories, then and now, have blinded many observers to their able and sometimes brilliant statesmanship during their period of ascendency. This fact explains the striking paradox that the party which played a large part in bringing the union into being, which single-handed placed it on a firm foundation, held a shorter tenure of power, and was more thoroughly repudiated than any other major party in American history. The formation of the Constitution is an achievement which scarcely needs further celebration. The same can be said for Hamilton's financial plans. Beyond this the Federalists suppressed domestic insurrection, humbled the Indians of the Northwest, and vindicated the national domain by the Jay and Pinckney treaties. In their more controversial policies—the Alien and Sedition Acts and the French War—something can be said in extenuation. The Alien and Sedition Acts were passed under extreme provocation, were more liberal than similar common law statutes, and were invoked in relatively few instances. If the high Federalists were determined to use the French War as a means of stamping out opposition to their policies, at least we would agree that modern experience with totalitarianism indicates that it was to the interest of the United States to support Britain against France.

But achievements alone do not guarantee the veneration of posterity—at least in America. The human qualities of tolerance, understanding, fair play, and—above all—compassion for the less powerful and less fortunate are indispensable for authentic American heroes. It was here that the Federalists made their egregious failure. In their philosophy and in their political appeals they alienated themselves from that indefinable but keenly felt quality—even in the late eighteenth century—the American tradition. The American Revolution had set a standard of political and social idealism which rapidly became a consensus for most Americans. In combatting it on so many fronts the Federalists consigned themselves to oblivion. The phrase "all men are created equal" evoked a strong emotional response. Fisher Ames's identification of equality with demagoguery and blood baths might have had some relevance in European history, and his dialectic might appropriately be applied to communism today, but when he used the French Revolution to discredit the kind of social system wanted by most Americans, he appeared as the Lord Protector of the very kind of social order the colonists had repudiated in 1776. Entranced by his apocalyptic vision of European revolution, Ames never realized that American conditions practically precluded a similar calamity here. Federalists as well as Republicans were quite aware that New England and even the South and West possessed a stable population of quite different characteristics from that of Europe. Yet they assumed without question that "equality" with its revolutionary results would be accepted as readily by the farmers of Massachusetts as by the impoverished peasants of France. They did not appreciate that Americans already had much of what the Jacobins so desperately wanted—freedom from feudal restrictions, a republican form of government, separation of church and state, and widespread ownership of land. It is unfair, of course, for the historian to condemn the past for its opinions, but it is quite justifiable to point out faulty social analysis from facts readily available at the time.

Moreover, the Federalist reading of history left something to be desired. The experience of the past did not lead necessarily to a pessimistic philosophy which postulated the final destruction of freedom. The history at Ames's disposal could as readily have been utilized to reach an optimistic result. Jefferson's reading and education closely paralleled that of Ames, for example, yet Jefferson used history not to justify a prediction of chaos but to indicate the pitfalls to be avoided in building a free society. The Federalist philosophy, far from preventing revolution, only provided an incentive for it. It is not difficult to imagine that if they had stayed in power after 1800 their original enlightened policies would have become thoroughly infected by their morbid philosophy. Driven toward hysteria by a Republican Party with a clear vision of the future of America, the Federalists might have precipitated the very type of crisis they strove so hard to avoid.

In evaluating the reasons for the failure of the Federalists, political and economic considerations should of course be taken into account. For legislative purposes the New England leaders

seemed to assume that the United States was bounded by the Kennebec on the North, Long Island Sound on the South, and the Hudson on the West. They made little attempt to reconcile their interests with those of the Southern members of their own party. Their commitment to funding, banks, expensive military and naval establishments, and internal taxes alienated the agrarian support indispensible for their continuance in power. They offered the American people nothing but themselves.[13] Thus the New England Junto split the party simultaneously on class and sectional lines, and completed the process of destruction by discrediting the only leader who had a popular following—John Adams. The destruction of the Federalist Party is high tragedy in the classical sense for it was the devoted, compulsive, unremitting work of the very men who brought the party into existence.

The last years of Fisher Ames were filled with pain and anxiety as he contemplated a party dissolution he had done much to bring about. Nearly every letter carried a bulletin on the declining state of his health. Always he anticipated an early demise. "If Jacobinism makes haste, I may yet live to be hanged," he wrote with grim humor to Pickering in 1804, four years before his death.[14] Yet often a lighter touch appeared side by side with the usual trumpetings of doom. For example, he ended one particularly gloomy note with the following: "I derive much entertainment from the squabbles in Madam Liberty's family. After so many liberties have been taken with her, I presume she is no longer a virgin, although she may still be a goddess."[15] Jefferson's celebrated First Inaugural Address got no plaudits from Ames. "I am edified as much as if I had heard a Methodist sermon in a barn," he wrote. "The men who have the best principles and those who act from the worst will talk alike, only that the latter will exceed the former in fervor. . . . Suppose a missionary should go to the Indians and preach self-denial and another should exhort them to drink rum. Which would first convert the heathen?"[16] Jefferson's proposal to reconcile the Louisiana purchase to the Constitution by an amendment provoked Ames's derision. "An amendment now," he wrote, "is like getting a dentist to put an artificial tooth in a dead man's head."[17]

In January of 1808 he wrote that he was out of bed only one or two days between sicknesses. In June, George Cabot reported that he was weak but still able to talk. He died on July 4, a fortunate occurrence for his Federalist friends who had planned the ceremonial funeral and a martyr's grave in Boston. Posterity has rendered a rather harsh verdict on Fisher Ames which unfortunately in many respects is deserved. But in fairness the man should be separated from his work, and Charity might plead that often he wrote unwisely and too well.

[13] For an interesting discussion of this point see Dauer, Manning J., *The Adams Federalists*, Ch. 17, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1953.

[14] To Pickering, Apr. 28, 1804. Pickering Papers, **27**: 91.

[15] *Ibid.*, March 10, 1806.

[16] Warren, Ames, *Dedham Historical Register*, 76.

[17] To Stephen Higginson, January 27, 1804. Pickering Papers, **27**: 60.

# DARWIN AND RELIGION

JOHN C. GREENE

Associate Professor of History, Iowa State College

(*Commemoration of the Centennial of the Publication of* The Origin of Species *by Charles Darwin, Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Society, April, 1959*)

THE purpose of this paper is to view Darwin and his writings in the broad perspective of the historical conflict between science and religion. The modern history of that conflict may be divided into three overlapping stages. In the first stage, the new physics and cosmology of the seventeenth century, combined with scientific, technological, and economic progress in the eighteenth, gave rise to natural religion, or deism, as a competitor of revealed religion. In the second stage, reaching its climax with Darwin, the further progress of science undermined the traditional conception of nature as a stable framework of rationally contrived structures, a view which had underlain both Christian natural theology and deism. In the third stage, beginning in Darwin's day and extending to the present, the methods of natural science were applied to the study of human nature and society, and these methods came to be regarded by many as the *only* methods which could yield knowledge of man and nature.

The first of these stages was already well underway by the time Darwin began to think seriously about religion. The Newtonian conception of nature as a law-bound system of matter in motion, when pushed to its logical conclusion, proved irreconcilable with belief in miracles, special providences, prophecies, and the like. These had provided the "external evidences" of the divine origin of the Bible and hence of Christianity. With respect to the "internal evidences," the spread of humanitarian feeling and of optimism concerning the prospects of human life in this world produced a moral revulsion against the God of the Old Testament and the pessimistic view of human nature expressed in traditional Christian doctrines. Finally, the very notion of revealed truth ran counter to the growing demand that all knowledge be based upon clear and distinct ideas derived from experience by reason and observation. In Germany the beginnings of the "higher criticism" made further inroads on belief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible, that is, the belief that everything in the Bible, properly interpreted, is substantially true. Darwin's account of the considerations which led him in the years 1836–1839 to abandon the Christian faith in which he had been reared will serve as a brief summary of these intellectual trends:

> . . . I had gradually come, by this time, to see that the Old Testament from its manifestly false history of the world and from its attributing to God the feelings of a revengeful tyrant, was no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the Hindoos, or the beliefs of any barbarian. The question then continually rose before my mind and would not be banished,—is it credible that if God were now to make a revelation to the Hindoos, would he permit it to be connected with the belief in Vishnu, Siva, &c, as Christianity is connected with the Old Testament. This appeared to me utterly incredible.
>
> By further reflecting that the clearest evidence would be requisite to make any sane man believe in the miracles by which Christianity is supported,—that the more we know of the fixed laws of nature the more incredible do miracles become,—that the men at that time were ignorant and credulous to a degree almost incomprehensible by us,—that the Gospels cannot be proved to have been written simultaneously with the events,—that they differ in many important details, far too important as it seemed to me to be admitted as the usual inaccuracies of eyewitnesses;—by such reflections as these, which I give not as having the least novelty or value, but as they influenced me, I gradually came to disbelieve in Christianity as a divine revelation. . . . This disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete. The rate was so slow that I felt no distress, and have never since doubted even for a single second that my conclusion was correct.[1]

One suspects that the painlessness of the process was not only due to its slowness but also because Darwin had never felt that deep anguish of the spirit to which Christianity ministers and which caused many of his contemporaries to cling to it

[1] Darwin, Charles, *The autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809–1882 with original omissions restored*, 85–86, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1959.

despite growing intellectual difficulties. This point will be amplified in connection with Darwin's anthropology.

What role did Darwin's writings play in the further transformation of attitudes toward the Bible and the idea of revealed religion? Most importantly they had the effect of bringing the Biblical narrative of the early history of man into doubt. Not that Darwin was the first to suggest that man's origins had been crude and bestial. Rousseau and Lord Monboddo had sketched the evolution of human nature from brutelike beginnings, and Lamarck had plainly implied man's apelike emergence in a long course of organic evolution. But Darwin converted the scientific community to this view. He thereby raised it from the status of a subversive speculation to that of a scientific theory strenuously defended by scientists in an age when the prestige of science was growing steadily. In this sense, Darwin's writings may be said to have acted as a catalyst, hastening a series of reactions which would have taken place eventually from other causes, such as the progress of Biblical criticism and new discoveries of fossil remains, but which now came rapidly.

Darwin himself avoided attacking the Bible, but for Huxley, his doughty champion against all comers, the battle against the doctrine of inspiration, whether plenary or otherwise, was the crucial engagement in the fight for evolution and for freedom of scientific inquiry.

> I am very glad that you see the importance of doing battle with the clericals, [he wrote to Joseph Dalton Hooker]. I am astounded at the narrowness of the view of many of our colleagues on this point. They shut their eyes to the obstacles which clericalism raises in every direction against scientific ways of thinking, which are even more important than scientific discoveries. I desire that the next generation may be less fettered by the gross and stupid superstitions of orthodoxy than mine has been. And I shall be well satisfied if I can succeed to however small an extent in bringing about that result.[2]

Surveying the polemical situation in 1893, Huxley felt that the battle against Biblical authority had largely been won.

> The doctrine of biblical infallibility [he wrote] . . . was widely held by my countrymen within my recollection: I have reason to think that many persons of unimpeachable piety, a few of learning, and even some of intelligence, yet uphold it. But I venture to entertain a doubt whether it can produce any champion whose competency and authority would be recognised beyond the limits of the sect, or theological coterie, to which he belongs. On the contrary, apologetic effort, at present, appears to devote itself to the end of keeping the name of "Inspiration" to suggest the divine source, and consequently infallibility, of more or less of the biblical literature, while carefully emptying the term of any definite sense. For "plenary inspiration" we are asked to substitute a sort of "inspiration with limited liability," the limit being susceptible of indefinite fluctuation in correspondence with the demands of scientific criticism.
>
> This Parthian policy is carried out with some dexterity; but, like other such manoeuvres in the face of a strong foe, it seems likely to end in disaster.[3]

Actually, the response to evolutionary biology within the Christian camp has been rather more varied than Huxley's words suggest. In some churches, notably the Roman Catholic, a slow but definite accommodation to evolutionary biology has taken place within the context of traditional doctrines concerning the inspiration of Scripture. According to the Reverend E. C. Messenger of Louvain, writing in 1949:

> Most [Catholic] theologians down to very recent times repudiated any form of evolutionary theory, even of plants and animals. Wiser counsels now seem to prevail, and a decided modification of the attitude of theologians is now being witnessed on the possibility of applying some restricted form of evolution to man. Theologians still seem to hold fast to the absolutely literal interpretation of the narrative of the formation of Eve. But the day may come when it will be more generally recognised that, in addition to the core of historical truth, the narrative contains figurative elements. Inevitably this presents the appearance of a losing battle, and of a rearguard action, in which successive positions are defended to the last, only to be abandoned under the pressure of necessity. A different attitude is surely desirable, and it would at least have the merit of a more wholehearted recognition that Science as well as Theology reveals to us truth concerning God and the world which He has made.[4]

[2] Huxley, Thomas, *Life and letters of Thomas Huxley* 3: 123–124, London, Macmillan, 1913.

[3] Huxley, Thomas, *Science and Hebrew tradition: essays*, "preface," vii, New York, Appleton, 1910.

[4] Messenger, E. C., *Theology and evolution*, 211, London and Glasgow, Sands & Company, 1949. This book is a useful compendium of Catholic opinion, including papal pronouncements on the question of evolution. In connection with Messenger's call for a new attitude toward evolution, it is worth noting the favorable interest recently shown by the Vatican in a lecture in Rome by Professor Johannes Hurzeler, curator of vertebrate

In Protestant circles the rise of evolutionary biology and of the higher criticism produced the opposing reactions known as modernism (or liberalism) and fundamentalism. Modernism abandoned the doctrine of plenary inspiration in favor of an evolutionary conception of the growth of religious ideas and sentiments; fundamentalism reaffirmed plenary inspiration in its narrowest form and rejected whatever in biology could not be reconciled with the letter of Scripture. This conflict of opinions is too familiar to require description here. Of more recent interest is the development of new conceptions of revelation and inspiration in the Protestant fold.

> In recent Protestant theology [Walter M. Horton writes] the old scholastic distinction between natural and revealed theology is generally questioned, and a new conception of revelation has appeared, based upon a less rationalistic theory of religious knowledge. According to this view, religious revelation does not consist of the communication of propositions about God to be believed; it consists of the confrontation of God and man through actual historical events, such as the Flight from Egypt, the Babylonian Captivity, and the Life of Christ. What is disclosed in such events is "not truth concerning God, but the living God Himself". . . . Since God confronts us through the meaning of events, any report or comment which powerfully conveys that meaning may be divinely inspired, whether or not it is factually inerrant. The Bible can thus convey a true revelation of God, and its writers can be God's inspired interpreters, while at the same time they are thoroughly human and fallible.[5]

Again Horton writes:

> For Niebuhr (as indeed for Barth himself . . .) the Word of God is something contemporaneous, or rather something eternal, which impinges upon our age through a human and fallible historic medium. Literal faith in the *ipsissima verba* of Scripture is a form of idolatry which God will punish as he will punish the idolatrous State-worship of our nationalistic contemporaries. But let the words of Scripture be taken as what Niebuhr calls "myths" and Barth calls "tokens"—symbolic expressions of truths too transcendent for human science to grasp, on which nevertheless our human fate depends—and they will lead us back to a fresh appreciation of Christian orthodoxy.[6]

At the same time, say the advocates of this view of revelation, the historic conflict between science and religion will be greatly mitigated, since religion and revelation are conceived to deal with those aspects of reality, especially the value aspect, which are inaccessible to science.

It would appear, then, that, although evolutionary biology has done much to stimulate a rethinking of the doctrines of revelation and inspiration, it has by no means relegated them to the limbo of exploded ideas.

In the second stage of the modern conflict between science and religion further scientific progress undermined the static conception of nature which had informed both Christian natural theology and deism. Here again, traditional views had begun to disintegrate before Darwin published, but his influence was nonetheless decisive. In the static version of the doctrine of creation, set forth in such works as John Ray's *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of the Creation* (1691) and William Paley's *Natural Theology* (Darwin said he knew it almost by heart), nature was conceived as a framework of rationally contrived structures fitted as a stage for the activities of intelligent beings. The basic structures of nature—stars, seas, mountains, species, etc.—were thought to be permanent and wisely contrived to fulfill certain functions in the general economy of nature. Change, though ever present, was superficial; it could not alter the fundamental aspect of things. Structure was perfectly adapted to function; harmony and balance prevailed in all the operations of nature. The lower forms of existence ministered to the needs of the higher.[7]

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries this view of nature was seriously shaken by the

paleontology at Basle University. Hurzeler described a skeleton four feet in height recently unearthed in a coal mine in Tuscany. He indicated that this creature must have lived more than ten million years ago and that it represented a high degree of "humanization."

[5] Horton, Walter M., Revelation, in: *A handbook of Christian theology: definition essays on concepts and movements of thought in contemporary Protestantism*, 327–328, New York, Meridian Books, 1958. See also Baillie, John, *The idea of revelation in recent thought*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1956.

[6] Horton, Walter M., The new orthodoxy, *The Amer. Scholar* **7**: 3–11, 1938, quoted in Gail Kennedy, ed., *Evolution and religion: the conflict between science and theology in modern America*, 88, Boston, D. C. Heath, 1957. This volume contains a useful bibliography on the subject of evolution and religion.

[7] For a fuller analysis of the static view of nature and the factors involved in its decline see my article, Objectives and methods in intellectual history, *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.* **44**: 58–74, 1957; also, my forthcoming book *The death of Adam: evolution and its impact on western thought*, scheduled for publication by the Iowa State College Press in October, 1959.

development of the nebular hypothesis in astronomy, by uniformitarian geology, by paleontology with its long catalogue of extinct species, and by the evolutionary speculations of Erasmus Darwin and Lamarck. Charles Darwin's contribution to the further disintegration of the traditional view was twofold. On the one hand, by converting the scientific community to belief in organic evolution he multiplied a thousand-fold the impact of evolutionary ideas on the traditional faith in the stability and wise design of the fundamental structures of nature. Secondly, in his emphasis on natural selection as the primary mechanism of evolution he knocked the last remaining prop from under the static view. Lamarck had recognized that the perpetual mutability of the inorganic environment implied the perpetual mutability of organic forms, but he believed that living matter was endowed (presumably by the Creator) with a capacity to undergo adaptive transformations in response to changing environmental requirements. Hence he was inclined to doubt the real extinction of species. For him, organic change was progressive precisely because it was adaptive. In Darwin's view, however, the variations which determined the survival or extinction of plants and animals were largely unconnected with their efforts to survive. Those organisms which *happened* to vary in such a way as to gain a competitive advantage in the struggle for existence survived; those which happened to vary in less fortunate directions dwindled in numbers and eventually became extinct. Thus, struggle and chance, the antitheses of pre-established harmony and wise design, became the engines of organic change and the architects of such adaptation as could be discerned in nature. This was the last and harshest blow to the traditional view of nature, a blow from which natural theology has not yet fully recovered.

Most of Darwin's contemporaries evaded the full force of the blow by transferring the element of wise design from the structures of nature themselves to the general system of matter in motion which had produced those structures in the course of time. This maneuver gave rise to precisely the kind of evolutionary theism which Immanuel Kant had foreshadowed a hundred years earlier, when, in propounding his theory of cosmic evolution, he declared:

> Matter, which is the primitive constituent of all things, is . . . bound to certain laws, and when it is freely abandoned to these laws it must necessarily bring forth beautiful combinations. It has no freedom to deviate from the perfect plan. Since it is thus subject to a supremely wise purpose, it must necessarily have been put into such harmonious relationships by a First Cause ruling over it; and *there is a God, just because nature even in chaos cannot proceed otherwise than regularly and according to order.*[8]

Applied to geology, biology, and eventually to history, this view of things harmonized with the nineteenth-century faith in progress and appealed to a wide variety of men and women, ranging from Christian liberals like John Fiske and Asa Gray to out-and-out agnostics like Herbert Spencer.

Darwin himself took a much less cheerful view of the theological consequences of his theory of natural selection. To those who achieved peace of mind by minimizing the role of natural selection and assuming some kind of directive agency or progressive tendency in the process of hereditary variation, Darwin replied that natural selection was the only means which could bring about the adaptation of organisms to their changing environments. To those who, like Asa Gray and Charles Lyell, proposed that God providentially supplied streams of variation in the right directions from which the environment could select, Darwin was equally unresponsive. If God provided the variations which were selected, did He also provide those which were eliminated? Did He also provide the variations which pigeon fanciers selected to please their own or other people's fancy? Did He determine the shape of Darwin's nose? If so, it amounted to saying that all variations were predetermined, those which resulted in beautiful adaptations and those which did not.

As Darwin saw all too clearly, the conception of nature as a law-bound system of matter in motion, when pushed to its ultimate conclusion, eventuated in stoicism. "The old argument of design in nature, as given by Paley, which formerly seemed to me so conclusive, fails, now that the law of natural selection has been discovered," he wrote. "There seems to be no more design in the variability of organic beings and in the action of natural selection, than in the course which the wind blows. Everything in nature is the result of fixed laws."[9] But Darwin could not look

[8] Kant, Immanuel, *Universal natural history and theory of the heavens . . .*, translated by William Hastie in *Kant's cosmogony . . .*, 26, Glasgow, J. Maclehose & Sons, 1900.

[9] Darwin, Charles, *Autobiography*, 87.

on the production of order and adaptation through the operation of natural laws with Immanuel Kant's optimistic enthusiasm. Presumably the laws of nature implied a law-giver, but what kind of law-giver would achieve the adaptation of structure to function by proliferating millions of variations at random and leaving it to the environment to eliminate those which did not happen to fit? What kind of law-giver would permit the enormous amount of suffering evident in nature? "What a book a devil's chaplain might write on the clumsy, wasteful, blundering, low, and horribly cruel works of nature!" Darwin exclaimed in a letter to Hooker. To Asa Gray he confessed like bewilderment:

> There seems to me too much misery in the world. I cannot persuade myself that a beneficent and omnipotent God would have designedly created the Ichneumonidae with the express intention of their feeding within the living bodies of caterpillars, or that a cat should play with mice. Not believing this, I see no necessity in the belief that the eye was expressly designed. On the other hand, I cannot anyhow be contented to view this wonderful universe, and especially the nature of man, and to conclude that everything is the result of brute force. I am inclined to look at everything as resulting from designed laws, with the details, whether good or bad, left to the working out of what we may call chance. Not that this notion *at all* satisfies me. I feel most deeply that the whole subject is too profound for the human intellect. A dog might as well speculate on the mind of Newton. Let each man hope and believe what he can.[10]

And so it went, around and around, in Darwin's head—law and chance, chance and law. The difficulty was that, when nature was conceived as a law-bound system of matter in motion, chance was but the other side of a coin stamped law. In the old view of nature, chance and change had been the antitheses of design and permanence. The forms of the species were regarded as designed by God; varieties were products of time and circumstance, of *chance*, not in the sense of being uncaused or not subject to law, but in the sense of not being a part of the original plan of creation. Now, in the evolutionary view of nature, change was everywhere, and everything was either chance or law depending on how one chose to look at it. Adaptation of structure to function was a *chance* outcome of the operations of nature in the sense of not being specifically arranged in terms of a preconceived plan for the economy of nature, but it was certainly not chance in the sense of being uncaused or spontaneous. Thus, Huxley answered the charge that Darwin had introduced chance into nature by pointing out that "chance variations" must result from the operation of definite laws. Darwin, he declared, had in no way destroyed the teleological view of nature, since the element of design was simply transferred from the present structures of nature to the hidden system of laws, elements, and forces which had produced them. Yet he, like Darwin, asserted repeatedly that he could see no purpose in nature. But what was a teleological view of nature which denied purpose, or *telos*, in nature? The old terms had taken on new meanings. Confusion was rampant.

Oddly enough, it was precisely the element of chance variation (taking *chance* not as the obverse of law but rather as its opposite) which recommended Darwin's theory to the American pragmatists Charles Peirce and William James as a means of deliverance from the mechanical determinism of nineteenth-century physics and chemistry—"the block universe eternal and without a history," as William James described it. Peirce's interpretation of the theory of natural selection was totally at variance with Darwin's conception of nature as a law-bound system of matter in motion. "In biology," wrote Peirce, "that tremendous upheaval caused in 1860 by Darwin's theory of fortuitous variations was but the consequence of a theorem in probabilities, namely, the theorem that if very many similar things are subject to very many slight fortuitous variations, as much in one direction as in the opposite direction, which when they aggregate a sufficient effect upon any one of those things in one direction must eliminate it from nature, while there is no corresponding effect of an aggregate of variations in other directions, the result must, in the long run, be to produce a change of the average characters of the class of things in the latter direction."[11] Peirce then went on to sub-

[10] Darwin to Asa Gray, Down, May 22, 1860, quoted in Francis Darwin, ed., *The life and letters of Charles Darwin including an autobiographical chapter* **2**: 105, New York, Appleton, 1898. See also Darwin's letter to Joseph Dalton Hooker, July 13, 1856, quoted in Francis Darwin, ed., *More letters of Charles Darwin . . .* **1**: 94, London, John Murray, 1903.

[11] Peirce, Charles, MSS., IB 3a "Folder of Late Fragments" ("Why should a Doctrine of Chances raise Science to a Higher Plane?") (Jan. 25, 1909), 15, quoted in Wiener, Philip, *Evolution and the founders of Pragmatism*, 81, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1949.

stitute a statistical conception of natural law for the traditional idea of natural law as a rigid pattern of behavior imposed on matter by the Creator, and to envisage the world process as a gradual growth of concrete reasonableness in the universe at large. In his opinion, a cosmogonic philosophy capable of representing the state of knowledge at which the West had arrived in his day

> would suppose that in the beginning—infinitely remote—there was a chaos of unpersonalized feeling, which being without connection or regularity would properly be without existence. This feeling, sporting here and there in pure arbitrariness, would have started the germ of a generalizing tendency. Its other sportings would be evanescent, but this would have a growing virtue. Thus, the tendency to habit would be started; and from this, with the other principles of evolution, all the regularities of the universe would be evolved. At any time, however, an element of pure chance survives and will remain until the world becomes an absolutely perfect, rational, and symmetrical system, in which mind is at last crystalized in the infinitely distant future.[12]

Or, as he put it in another place:

> . . . the coalescence, the becoming continuous, the becoming governed by laws, the becoming instinct with general ideas are but phases of one and the same process of growth of reasonableness. This is first shown to be true with mathematical exactitude in the field of logic, and is thence inferred to hold good metaphysically.[13]

Likewise, William James, Henri Bergson, A. N. Whitehead, and others, each in his own way, found in the idea of organic evolution the key to a new cosmology in which spontaneity, novelty, and purpose had a place, a place which had been denied them in the cosmology inherited from the seventeenth century. The influence of these new ideas may be seen in the writings of modern students of evolution, as when Professor Dobzhansky writes, somewhat mystically: "In producing life, cosmic evolution overcame its own bounds; in giving rise to man, biological evolution transcended itself. Human evolution may yet ascend to a superhuman level." [14]

To summarize concerning Darwin's role with respect to the second stage of the conflict between science and religion: On the one hand, he gave the death blow to traditional natural theology by drawing out the ultimate implications for biology of the conception of nature as a law-bound system of matter in motion. On the other hand, he helped to precipitate a cosmological revolution (developing independently within physics itself) which threw into doubt the Newtonian cosmology Darwin and Huxley had taken for granted. Nature was open once more to the elements of value, purpose, and novelty which Newton and his contemporaries had extruded from it except in so far as they thought to find them in the wise design of the structures of nature.

We come now to the third stage of the conflict between science and religion, the stage in which the methods and attitudes of natural science were extended to the study of man, his history and institutions, political, economic, religious, and moral. The hope for a natural science of man and society had been voiced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it was Herbert Spencer, in the mid-nineteenth century, who first proposed that the evolution of human history and human institutions be viewed as a simple extension of cosmic and organic evolution, continuous with them and subject to the same general laws. In his essay entitled "Progress: Its Law and Cause," published in 1857, Spencer discerned in the whole universe a progressive development from homogeneity to heterogeneity. Progress seemed written into the structure of things. It was "not an accident, not a thing within human control, but a beneficent necessity." In human history, said Spencer, progress had come about primarily through a competition of individuals and races. Those who were best adapted to the changing requirements of the environment won out over those less well-adapted, thus setting the stage for still further progress.[15]

The relation between Darwin and Spencer is an interesting one. On the one hand, Darwin was highly suspicious of Spencer's intellectual methods. "My mind," he wrote Spencer's American disciple John Fiske, "is so fixed by the inductive method, that I cannot appreciate deductive reasoning . . . such parts of H. Spencer as I have read with care impress my mind with the

[12] Peirce, Charles, *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce* **6**: paragraph 33, quoted in Wiener, *op. cit.*, 84.

[13] *Ibid.* **5**: paragraph 4, quoted in Wiener, *op. cit.*, 91.

[14] Dobzhansky, Theodosius, *The biological basis of human freedom*, 27, New York, Columbia University Press, 1956.

[15] For a fuller account of Spencer's ideas as well as those of Auguste Comte, see my article Biology and social theory in the nineteenth century: Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer, *Critical problems in the history of science* (Paper No. 14), scheduled for publication by the Wisconsin University Press in the fall of 1959.

idea of his inexhaustible wealth of suggestion, but never convince me."[16] On the other hand, there can be no question that Darwin shared Spencer's belief in necessary, if somewhat sporadic, improvement in both nature and history and regarded natural selection as the chief engine of progress in both. The modern reader is rather surprised to see how frequently Darwin uses the terms "improve" and "improvement" in discussing natural selection. When Lyell protested that natural selection need not imply natural improvement unless there were some "principle of improvement" at work in nature independently of natural selection, Darwin replied:

> When you contrast natural selection and "improvement," you seem always to overlook . . . that every step in the natural selection of each species implies improvement in that species in relation to its conditions of life. No modification can be selected without it be an improvement or advantage. Improvement implies, I suppose, each form obtaining many parts or organs, all excellently adapted for their functions. As each species is improved, and as the number of forms will have increased, if we look to the whole course of time, the organic condition of life for other forms will become more complex, and there will be a necessity for other forms to become improved, or they will be exterminated; and I can see no limit to this process of improvement, without the intervention of any other and direct principle of improvement. All this seems to me quite compatible with certain forms fitted for simple conditions, remaining unaltered, or being degraded.[17]

But what was the criterion of "improvement"? Not simply survival, for Darwin was quick to concede that natural selection might bring about developments which constituted "retrogression" when viewed against the trend of development as a whole. Improvement in the latter sense seemed to imply some notion of "higher" forms of life capable of surviving in a wider range of environments. But Darwin and his colleagues Hooker and Huxley could never decide just what they meant by "higher" and "lower" forms. "I do not think zoologists agree in any definite ideas on this subject and my ideas are not clearer than those of my brethren," Darwin wrote Hooker.[18] But, if there was no precise criterion of "higher" and "lower," there could be no precise meaning to general improvement as distinct from competitive advantage in a specific situation. Ironically enough, Wallace and Darwin both thought that much of the ambiguity in this respect might have been avoided if instead of using the term "natural selection," loaded with implications of intelligent choice, Darwin had used instead Spencer's term "survival of the fittest." Nowadays, on the contrary, biologists lament that Spencer's term was ever adopted, even secondarily, because of the difficulty of defining a criterion of fitness and of stripping it of value implications. The moral of the story would seem to be that biologists can neither live with nor live without normative concepts implying standards of excellence. Thus, G. S. Carter, in his recent survey *A Hundred Years of Evolution,* struggles with the "problems raised by the element of progress in evolution." "These," he declares, "are the most fundamental of all, for it is the progressive nature of biological evolution, its progress from the simple to the complex, towards a 'better' organism and more 'efficient' life, that is the most outstanding characteristic of evolution in living nature."[19] Professor Carter's liberal use of quotation marks in this passage betrays his uneasiness at introducing what are essentially normative concepts into a science which he regards as "necessarily mechanistic."

Whatever the difficulties involved in the notion of progressive improvement by natural selection in the realm of nature, they were as nothing compared to those which Darwin and Spencer encountered when they attempted to carry the idea over into human history. That mankind *had* progressed and would continue to progress Darwin seldom doubted. "I cannot explain why," he wrote to Lyell in 1860, "but to me it would be an infinite satisfaction to believe that mankind will progress to such a pitch that we should [look] back at [ourselves] as mere Barbarians." Again he wrote: "I am sorry to say that I have no 'consolatory view' on the dignity of man. I am content that man will probably advance, and care not much whether we are looked at as mere savages in a remotely distant future." "To believe that man was aboriginally civilised and then suffered utter degradation in so many regions," he declared in *The Descent of Man,* "is to take a pitiably low view of human nature. It is appar-

[16] Darwin to John Fiske, Down, December 8, 1874, *Life and letters* **2**: 371.

[17] Darwin to Charles Lyell, Ilkley, Yorkshire, October 25, 1859, *Life and letters* **1**: 531.

[18] Darwin to J. D. Hooker, Down, 1854, *More letters* **1**: 76.

[19] Carter, G. S., *A hundred years of evolution,* 181, New York, Macmillan, 1957.

ently a truer and more cheerful view that progress has been much more general than retrogression; that man has risen, though by slow and interrupted steps, from a lowly condition to the highest standard as yet attained by him in knowledge, morals and religion." [20] This progress, he added, gave hope for "a still higher destiny in the distant future."

A very comforting, even inspiring, view of things this, but there were ambiguities in it, both as to the criterion of improvement and as to the method by which it had taken place and would take place. These difficulties may be illustrated with respect to Darwin's account of the origin and progress of the *moral sense*, which he regarded as the chief attribute distinguishing man from the lower animals. In Darwin's view, the moral sense sprang from the interaction of the social instincts with man's superior intellectual powers, the whole process being guided by natural selection.

> It must not be forgotten [he wrote in *The Descent of Man*] that although a high standard of morality gives a slight or no advantage to each individual man and his children over the other men of the same tribe, yet . . . an increase in the number of well-endowed men and an advancement in the standard of morality will certainly give an immense advantage to one tribe over another. A tribe including many members who, from possessing in a high degree the spirit of patriotism, fidelity, obedience, courage, and sympathy, were always ready to aid one another, and to sacrifice themselves for the common good, would be victorious over most other tribes; and this would be natural selection. At all times throughout the world tribes have supplanted other tribes; and as morality is one important element in their success, the standard of morality and the number of well-endowed men will thus everywhere tend to rise and increase. . . . But as man gradually advanced in intellectual power, and was enabled to trace the more remote consequences of his actions; as he acquired sufficient knowledge to reject baneful customs and superstitions; as he regarded more and more, not only the welfare, but the happiness of his fellow-men; as from habit, following on beneficial experience, instruction, and example, his sympathies became more tender and widely diffused, extending to men of all races, to the imbecile, maimed, and other useless members of society, and finally to the lower animals,—so would the standard of his morality rise higher and higher. . . . Looking to future generations, there is no cause to fear that the social instinct will grow weaker, and we may expect that virtuous habits will grow stronger, becoming perhaps fixed by inheritance. In this case the struggle between our higher and lower impulses will be less severe, and virtue will be triumphant.[21]

But, it may be asked, if human sympathies become extended to all mankind, to all races and nations, to the imbecile and the maimed, the so-called useless members of society, what becomes of the competitive struggle and hence of the progress of man? Here, indeed, was a dilemma, and Darwin was caught squarely on the horns of it.

> Man, like every other animal, [he wrote] has no doubt advanced to his present high condition through a struggle for existence consequent on his rapid multiplication; and if he is to advance still higher it is to be feared that he must remain subject to a severe struggle. Otherwise he would sink into indolence, and the more gifted men would not be more successful in the battle of life than the less gifted. Hence our natural rate of increase, though leading to many and obvious evils, must not be greatly diminished by any means. There should be open competition for all men; and the most able should not be prevented by laws or customs from succeeding best and rearing the largest number of offspring.[22]

This would seem a frank enough avowal of Spencer's "Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost," but Darwin immediately adds that the moral qualities, though developed in part by the struggle for existence, are developed even more "through the effects of habit, the reasoning powers, instruction, religion, &c." than through natural selection.

Darwin's reference to the elevating influence of religion on the moral sense is interesting in view of the precarious state of his own religious beliefs. Speaking as an anthropologist, he thought to find the origin of religious ideas in the fears and dreams of primitive peoples. Presumably it was only in the later stages of social advance that religion exercised a beneficial influence on morality. "The idea of a universal and beneficent Creator," he noted, "does not seem to arise in the mind of man, until he has been elevated by long-continued culture." Yet the latest advances

[20] Darwin, Charles, *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*, new edition, revised and augmented, 145, New York, Appleton, 1886. See also Darwin's letter to Lyell, Down, January 4th?, 1860, *Life and letters* **2**: 56, and another letter to the same, Down, April 27, 1860, *More letters* **2**: 30.

[21] Darwin, *Descent of man*, 124–125, 132.

[22] *Ibid.*, 618. See also pages 133–134.

in science, to which Darwin himself had contributed mightily, seemed to undermine belief in such a Creator. Science, in discovering the secret of man's lowly origin and the equally humble origin of his highest thoughts and aspirations, seemed to Darwin to have destroyed confidence in man's reason and in his deepest intuitions when confronted with the ultimate questions of human existence. Darwin himself confessed to an "inward conviction" that the universe was not the result of chance. "But then," he added, "with me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would any one trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind." [23]

Here, indeed, was agnosticism, an agnosticism which trusted in the power of science to trace the origin of stars and planets, mountains and species, morality and religion, but which to all the deepest questions of the human spirit returned an *Ignoro*, followed by an *Ignorabo*. These were gloomy thoughts, and they were but little relieved by Darwin's rather ambiguous belief in the progress of man. For over human progress lay a dark shadow—"the idea," he wrote to Hooker, "or rather I presume the certainty of the sun some day cooling and we all freezing. To think of the progress of millions of years, with every continent swarming with good and enlightened men, all ending in this, and with probably no fresh start until this our planetary system has been again converted into red-hot gas. *Sic transit gloria mundi*, with a vengeance. . . ." [24]

There was, however, an even more dreadful thought which never occurred to Darwin because he assumed that the progress of science and civilization necessarily brought moral improvement in its wake. This was the thought, all too familiar to the present generation, that man might perish not through some natural catastrophe but by his own hand, because the progress of science and technology, of man's intellectual powers, had outrun the progress of human sympathy and understanding.

These difficulties and ambiguities in Darwin's reflections on nature, man, and God would not be worth rehearsing at such great length if they had been *his* difficulties alone. After all, he was primarily a biologist and a very great one. It would perhaps be too much to expect any biologist since Aristotle to be simultaneously a great moral philosopher and social thinker. But Darwin's difficulties and inadequacies were those of his age and of the age which succeeded. They entered deeply into biological and social thought and still do. The genetic fallacy which led Darwin to suppose that the religious beliefs of mankind were adequately accounted for in terms of the dreams and fears of primitive peoples was to permeate sociology and cultural anthropology for many years to come. The sociological positivism which identified Kant's categorical imperative as the voice of society built into the individual by a long course of social training was to reappear in Freud and Durkheim. The anti-metaphysical bias which relegated to the realm of the unknowable everything which could not be formulated scientifically was to become even more pronounced. The conception of human progress as an outcome of competitive struggle between individuals, nations, and races was to wreak incalculable havoc in the custody of men less deeply humanitarian than Darwin. Finally, the confident assumption that the progress of intellect, especially of science and the scientific attitude, is necessarily accompanied by moral and cultural progress still lingers on despite the shattering events of our own age and the threat of atomic destruction. "Judged by any reasonable criteria," Professor Dobzhansky writes in his recent book *The Biological Basis of Human Freedom*, "man represents the highest, most progressive, and most successful product of organic evolution. . . . Most remarkable of all, he is now in the process of acquiring knowledge which may permit him, if he so chooses, to control his own evolution. He may yet become 'business manager for the cosmic process of evolution,' a role which Julian Huxley has ascribed to him, perhaps prematurely." [25]

What should a sane man think of this? Should he conclude with Sir Julian that the cosmic process, after billions of years of labor, has finally brought forth a creature, man, who is ready or nearly ready to direct the future course of things? Or should he rather regard the very entertaining of such an idea as a symptom of the madness with

[23] Darwin to William Graham, Down, July 3, 1881, *Life and letters* **1**: 285.

[24] Darwin to J. D. Hooker, Down, February 9, 1865, *More letters* **1**: 260–261.

[25] Dobzhansky, *Biological basis of human freedom*, 87–88. See also Huxley, Sir Julian, *Evolution in action*, 116, New York, Mentor Books, 1957.

which the gods afflict those whom they would destroy?

To summarize: With respect to revealed religion, Darwin's writings helped to precipitate a rethinking of traditional doctrines concerning inspiration and revelation, a rethinking which has proceeded in several directions and is still going on.

With respect to natural religion, Darwin shattered its traditional basis by exhibiting the adaptation of structure to function in the organic world as a necessary outcome of random variation, struggle for existence, and natural selection. For many of his contemporaries the blow was softened by the indomitable faith of the nineteenth century in progress, a faith which enabled them to view the world-machine as a divinely contrived mechanism for insuring perpetual improvement in nature and history. But Darwin found little comfort in this view. Progress was too slow, too sporadic and haphazard, too precarious to reflect much credit on the Creator, if there was one. But though Darwin remained a prisoner of the law-bound system of matter in motion which he had extended to biology, others found in his theory of organic evolution a way of escape from the gloomy confines of that system. The revolution in biology was soon followed by a revolution in physics and cosmology.

With respect to the third stage of the conflict, in which the methods of natural science were applied to the study of man and society, Darwin played a pioneer role. His writings in this field are valuable not so much for their scientific content as for the light they throw on the difficulties inherent in the concept of social science. Like Spencer, Darwin attempted to apply the concepts of biology to human history; like Spencer, he wound up in hopeless contradictions. Biology afforded no criterion of progress for a creature like man, and Darwin was forced to bring in other criteria, imported surreptitiously from his Christian background. To the very end, he failed to appreciate the morally ambiguous character of human progress. He failed because, like many social scientists today, he had no adequate conception of man. Whatever his origin, man is a very peculiar creature, whose inmost being eludes the abstractions of science. For science, since it adopts the point of view of the detached observer, has no access to those aspects of reality which can be known only from the point of view of the actor. Yet, ultimately, the scientist himself is an actor in the difficult human situation, and science becomes pointless and even destructive unless it takes on significance and direction from a religious affirmation concerning the meaning and value of human existence.

# MEMOIRS OF THE
# AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

**Letters of Benjamin Rush.** L. H. BUTTERFIELD.
Vol. 30. lxxxvii, 1295 pp., 18 figs. 2 v. 1951. $15.00.

**Erwin Frink Smith—A Story of North American Plant Pathology.** ANDREW DENNY RODGERS III.
Vol. 31. x, 675 pp., 4 figs. 1952. $5.00.

**The Primitive City of Timbuctoo.** HORACE MINER.
Vol. 32. xx, 297 pp., 27 figs. 1953. $5.00.

**Age and Achievement.** HARVEY C. LEHMAN.
Vol. 33. xi, 359 pp., 170 figs. 1953. $7.50.

**Michael Servetus—A Translation of his Geographical, Medical and Astrological Writings.** CHARLES DONALD O'MALLEY.
Vol. 34. 208 pp., 6 figs. 1954. $3.00.

**Thomas Jefferson's Farm Book.** EDWIN MORRIS BETTS.
Vol. 35. xxiii, 722 pp., 8 pls. 1953. $12.00.

**The Long Parliament, 1640–1641. A Biographical Study of its Members.** MARY FREAR KEELER.
Vol. 36. ix, 410 pp. 1954. $6.00.

**Astrology in Roman Law and Politics.** FREDERICK H. CRAMER.
Vol. 37. x, 291 pp., 22 figs., 1 map. 1954. $5.00.

**Cumulative Record of Exhibition Catalogues. The Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts 1807–1870.** ANNA WELLS RUTLEDGE.
Vol. 38. v, 450 pp. 1955. $6.00.

**Historic Germantown. From the Founding to the Early Part of the Nineteenth Century. A Survey of the German Township.** HARRY M. and MARGARET B. TINKCOM, GRANT M. SIMON.
Vol. 39. vii, 154 pp., 241 figs., 5 maps. $5.00.

**The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity.** WILLIAM L. WESTERMANN.
Vol. 40. xii, 180 pp. 1955. $3.00.

**Edmund Burke, New York Agent, with his Letters to the New York Assembly and Intimate Correspondence with Charles O'Hara, 1761–1776.** ROSS J. S. HOFFMAN.
Vol. 41. xiv, 632 pp., 3 figs. 1956. $6.50.

**An Historian's World. Selections from the Correspondence of John Franklin Jameson.** ELIZABETH DONNAN and LEO F. STOCK.
Vol. 42. xi, 382 pp., 1 fig. 1956. $6.00.

**Franklin and Newton.** I. BERNARD COHEN.
Vol. 43. xxvi, 657 pp., 24 figs. 1956. $6.00.

**A History of Luminescence from the Earliest Times until 1900.** E. NEWTON HARVEY.
Vol. 44. xxiii, 692 pp., 50 figs. 1957. $6.00.

**Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, United States, 1870–1950. I. Methodological Considerations and Reference Tables.** EVERETT S. LEE, ANN RATNER MILLER, CAROL P. BRAINERD, RICHARD A. EASTERLIN. Prepared under the direction of SIMON KUZNETS and DOROTHY SWAINE THOMAS.
Vol. 45. 759 pp. 1957. $5.00.

**Give Me Liberty. The Struggle for Self-Government in Virginia.** THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER.
Vol. 46. ix, 275 pp., 7 figs. 1958. $3.00.

**Benjamin Franklin and Italy.** ANTONIO PACE.
Vol. 47. xiii, 450 pp., 9 figs. 1958. $5.00.

**Greek Horoscopes.** O. NEUGEBAUER AND H. B. VAN HOESEN.
Vol. 48. ix, 231 pp., 32 pls., 38 figs. 1959. $6.00.

**Jan Evangelista Purkyně, Czech Scientist and Patriot, 1787–1869.** HENRY J. JOHN.
Vol. 49. xi, 94 pp., 26 figs. 1959. $3.00.

# TRANSACTIONS
## OF THE
# AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

---

**Klamath Prehistory: The Prehistory of the Culture of the Klamath Lake Area, Oregon.** L. S. Cressman.
Vol. 46, pt. 4, 139 pp., 73 figs., 1956. $2.00.

**Excavations at Chupícuaro, Guanajuato, Mexico.** Muriel Noé]Porter.
Vol. 46, pt. 5, 123 pp., 30 figs., 3 maps, 10 plans, 1956. $1.75.

**The Monguors of the Kansu-Tibetan Frontier. Part II. Their Religious Life.** Louis M. J. Schram.
Vol. 47, pt. 1, 164 pp., 1957. $3.00.

**Comparative Studies of North American Indians.** Harold E. Driver and William C. Massey.
Vol. 47, pt. 2, 292 pp., 164 maps, 31 figs., 1957. $5.00.

**The Cultivation and Weaving of Cotton in the Prehistoric Southwestern United States.** Kate Peck Kent.
Vol. 47, pt. 3, 276 pp., 143 figs., 13 maps, 1957. $4.00.

**The Sixteenth-Century Pokom-Maya: A Documentary Analysis of Social Structure and Archaeological Setting.** S. W. Miles.
Vol. 47, pt. 4, 49 pp., 4 figs., 1957. $2.00.

**Maistre Nicole Oresme: Le Livre de Yconomique d'Aristote.** Albert Douglas Menut.
Vol. 47, pt. 5, 71 pp., 1 fig., 1957. $2.00.

**Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople.** Glanville Downey.
Vol. 47, pt. 6, 71 pp., 1957. $2.00.

**The Mycenae Tablets II.** Emmett L. Bennett, Jr. With an introduction by Alan J. B. Wace and Elizabeth B. Wace. Translations and commentary by John Chadwick.
Vol. 48, pt. 1, 122 pp., 111 figs., 1958. $3.00.

**The Neolithic Age in Eastern Siberia.** Henry N. Michael.
Vol. 48, pt. 2, 108 pp., 100 figs., 7 maps, 1958. $2.50.

**Late Ancient and Medieval Population.** J. C. Russell.
Vol. 48, pt. 3, 152 pp., 1958. $4.00.

**The Search for a New Voltaire. Studies in Voltaire Based upon Material Deposited at the American Philosophical Society.** Ira O. Wade.
Vol. 48, pt. 4, 206 pp., 1958. $5.00.

**Surface Survey of the Northern Valley of Mexico: the Classic and Post-Classic Periods.** Paul Tolstoy.
Vol. 48, pt. 5, 101 pp., 24 figs., 1958. $2.00.

**Preliminary Archaeological Investigations in the Sierra de Tamaulipas, Mexico.** Richard S. MacNeish.
Vol. 48, pt. 6, 210 pp., 51 figs., 1958. $5.00.

**The Spectrum of Beta Lyrae.** J. Sahade, S.-S. Huang, O. Struve, and V. Zebergs.
Vol. 49, pt. 1, 64 pp., 20 figs., 30 pls., 1959. $2.00.

**Edward T. Cardwell: Peelite.** Arvel B. Erickson.
Vol. 49, pt. 2, 107 pp., 1959. $2.00.

**Aleut Dialects of Atka and Attu.** Knut Bergsland.
Vol. 49, pt. 3, 128 pp., 23 figs., 1959. $3.00.

**The Medieval Theories of the Just Price. Romanists, Canonists, and Theologians in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries.** John W. Baldwin.
Vol. 49, pt. 4, 92 pp., 1959. $2.00.

**The Anatomy of Callimico goeldii (Thomas)—A Primitive American Primate.** W. C. Osman Hill.
Vol. 49, pt. 5, 116 pp., 77 figs., 1959. $2.50.

## CHANGE OF ADDRESS

After September 15, 1959, the permanent address of the *Library* of the American Philosophical Society is:

105 South Fifth Street
Philadelphia 6, Pa.

The *Executive and Publication Offices* remain in the Hall of the Society at:

104 South Fifth Street
Philadelphia 6, Pa.